

AMERICAN - ASSOCIATION
of UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
Bulletin

Volume 38

Autumn 1952

Number 3

Editor

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD

Associate Editors

WARREN C. MIDDLETON

GEORGE POPE SHANNON

Editorial Committee

JEWELL HUGHES BUSHEY

WILLIAM T. LAPRADE

EDWARD C. KIRKLAND

LOUISE POUND

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Streets, Easton, Pa. *Editorial Office:* 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D.C. Issued quarterly: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December). Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions including Canada are \$3.50 a year. Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

FRED B. MILLETT (*English Literature*) Wesleyan University

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

DR SCOTT (*Economics*) University of Missouri

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

GEORGE W. MARTIN (*Botany*) State University of Iowa

GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (*Government, Law*) Washington Office

ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

GEORGE POPE SHANNON (*English*) Washington Office

STAFF ASSOCIATE

WARREN C. MIDDLETON (*Psychology*) Washington Office

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

TERM MEMBERS

1950-1952

W. E. ALLEY (<i>Economics</i>)	Drake University
W. EDWARD BROWN (<i>Greek, Ancient History</i>)	Lafayette College
MARJORIE DILLEY (<i>Political Science</i>)	Connecticut College
JAMES W. FESLER (<i>Political Science</i>)	Yale University
J. FAGG FOSTER (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Denver
ROYAL M. FRYE (<i>Physics</i>)	Simmons College
WARREN C. MIDDLETON (<i>Psychology</i>)	DePauw University
EVA M. SANFORD (<i>History</i>)	Sweet Briar College
WARREN TAYLOR (<i>English</i>)	Oberlin College
LLOYD B. WILLIAMS (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Reed College

1951-1953

MYRTLE AUSTIN (<i>English</i>)	University of Utah
HAROLD M. DORR (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of Michigan
E. FRANKLIN FRAZIER (<i>Sociology</i>)	Howard University
BRUNSON MACCHESNEY (<i>Law</i>)	Northwestern University
GORDON H. McNEIL (<i>History</i>)	Coe College
WILLIS MOORE (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of Tennessee
RALPH BARTON PERRY (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Harvard University
CARL SHOUP (<i>Economics</i>)	Columbia University
ROBERT E. TODD, JR. (<i>Zoology</i>)	Colgate University
EUGENE H. WILSON (<i>Library Science</i>)	University of Colorado

1952-1954

FREDERICK K. BEUTEL (<i>Law</i>)	University of Nebraska
LEWIS C. BRANSCOMB (<i>Library Administration</i>)	The Ohio State University
ROBERT B. BRODB (<i>Physics</i>)	University of California
ROBERT K. CARR (<i>Political Science</i>)	Dartmouth College
HAROLD L. CLAPP (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	Grinnell College
J. ERSKINE HAWKINS (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Florida
ELMER LOUIS KAYSER (<i>History</i>)	The George Washington University
DONALD E. MILLER (<i>Biology</i>)	Ball State Teachers College
ROSALIND TOUGH (<i>Sociology</i>)	Hunter College
PAUL L. WHITELY (<i>Psychology</i>)	Franklin and Marshall College

FORMER PRESIDENTS

EDWARD C. KIRKLAND (<i>History</i>)	Bowdoin College
RALPH H. LUTZ (<i>History</i>)	Stanford University
RICHARD H. SHRYOCK (<i>History</i>)	The Johns Hopkins University

CONTENTS

LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, <i>H. W. Prentis, Jr.</i>	345
NEGLECTED AREAS IN EDUCATION, <i>Oliver C. Carmichael</i>	356
A NINETEENTH-CENTURY ACADEMIC CAUSE CÈLÈBRE, <i>Elizabeth Donnan</i>	368
THE NEW AUTHORITARIANISM, <i>George Boas</i>	390
LIBERTY AND THE PURSUIT OF TRUTH, <i>Joseph E. Baker</i>	402
"LIFE ADJUSTMENT" EDUCATION: A Critique, <i>Arthur E. Bestor, Jr.</i>	413
<i>Whose Good English?</i> <i>Louis B. Salomon</i>	442
TEXTBOOKS AND THE TEACHING PROCESS, <i>Bernard Levy</i>	450
FOOTBALL AND THE UNIVERSITY, <i>Van Cleve Morris</i>	460
CONCERNING INDIVIDUAL FEDERAL INCOME TAX RETURNS IN 1953.....	469
REPORT OF THE 1952 NOMINATING COMMITTEE.....	471
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	479
MEMBERSHIP.....	480
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	497
THE ASSOCIATION'S CORRESPONDENCE.....	506

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

Contributors to This Issue

JOSEPH E. BAKER is Professor of English, State University of Iowa.

General Studies, The City College (New York).

ARTHUR E. BESTOR, JR., is Professor of History, University of Illinois.

VAN CLEVE MORRIS is Assistant Professor of Education, University of Georgia.

GEORGE BOAS is Professor of the History of Philosophy, The Johns Hopkins University.

H. W. PRENTIS, JR., is Chairman of the Board, Armstrong Cork Company. He is a trustee of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Franklin and Marshall College, Temple University, Wilson College, and a trustee of Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association Stock and of the College Retirement Equities Fund.

OLIVER C. CARMICHAEL is President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

ELIZABETH DONNAN is Professor Emeritus of Economics, Wellesley College.

BERNARD LEVY is Professor of Romance Languages and Director, School of

LOUIS B. SALOMON is Assistant Professor of English, Brooklyn College.

LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY¹

By H. W. PRENTIS, JR.

Armstrong Cork Company

I have long had a deep and abiding interest in young college graduates. In fact, I owe a group of several hundred such men in our own Company a lasting debt of gratitude. Their mental acumen, boundless energy, and unswerving loyalty have enabled certain of us older men in the organization, including myself, to occupy the positions we do. I have long held the conviction, moreover, that a college education is of tremendous assistance—not only in making a living but in making a life. So, as the beneficiary of such training myself, I should have felt a traitor to the cause had I failed to raise my voice this evening in behalf of that type of education which I regard as vital for any man who aspires to business leadership.

First, let me trace briefly the history of American commerce and industry for the past century. It seems to me that four general types of businessmen are clearly discernible, corresponding roughly to what might be termed four stages in the evolution of business in the United States. One type overlaps another and one can find examples of businessmen of all four types existing contemporaneously. The mere fact, however, that a sharp and clearly demarcated classification in each individual case is impossible does not impair the validity of the general conclusion to which the analysis leads.

In the sort of business which existed prior to the Civil War we find a predominance of the first type, namely, the owners of small individual businesses, largely local in character. This does not imply that there were not commercial organizations of noteworthy size and potency in antebellum days, but certainly there was

¹ Address given at a meeting of the Trustees of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association in New York City on November 20, 1952.

nothing then that compared in scope or magnitude with corporate enterprises of the twentieth century.

The second type embraces the so-called captains of industry: the Jay Goulds, the Commodore Vanderbilts, the Jay Cookes, the Andrew Carnegies, the John D. Rockefellers—developers of transportation systems, exploiters of natural resources. Such men were at times ruthless in their dealings with the public and customarily did not hesitate to utilize every means at their command—banks, insurance companies, corporations—to promote their own personal and affiliated interests.

The third group is more difficult to define. Generally speaking, it consisted of corporate speculators and plungers. This class followed more or less closely on the heels of the old captains of industry and in many instances endeavored to emulate their methods. There was this difference, however; they were usually merely business executives, not owners of their own businesses. Hence, they made their fortunes by using the resources of their own concerns to help each other reciprocally in their various speculative ventures. In the field of finance, the difference between the old-time banker who considered himself primarily the trustee of his stockholders' and depositors' money and the speculative banker whose chief object was to make quick profits by participating in as many syndicates and promotions as possible, was never so clear as during those years of riotous speculation in the late 1920's.

Although candor compels the admission that there are still perhaps a few of the third type operating today, yet any fair observer can also truthfully affirm that the fourth type is steadily appearing in larger and larger numbers—its emergence being hastened by the growth of American business generally. I refer to what are commonly known as "career men" in business: men who can never hope to own any large portion of the enterprise of which they are a part; men who realize that the bonanza days of the old captains of industry are over; men who see in business something more than the mere making of money; men who are imbued with a deep sense of social stewardship; men who are keenly sensible of the fact that they are the trustees of other people's money with heavy responsibilities to discharge to employees and the public as well as to stockholders; men who find deep spiritual satisfaction in the

direction of their brains and energy toward the creation of a better and more abundant life for all of their fellow human beings.

Despite all that may be said by caustic critics, despite the existence of Babbitts by the score and hundred, I submit that there has never been a period in the world's history when there has been so much progress toward the goal of sounder trade morals, higher business ethics, and a keener sense of social responsibility in industry as there has been during the past quarter century. And in this whole effort we find the career man—usually, but by no means always, a liberally educated man—in the forefront in the battle to raise the standards of the business of which he is a part. Men of this fourth type expect to find their future in the profession of business just as surely as the skilled physician, lawyer, teacher, or architect anticipates finding his future in the honorable practice of his calling.

II

What are the characteristics of a profession? The first paragraph of the code of the American Medical Association reads: "A physician should be imbued with the greatness of his mission and the responsibility which he habitually incurs in its discharge." A deep sense of responsibility seems to be the distinguishing characteristic of all professional workers, and the recognition of that personal responsibility to be the root of professional ethics. Pride in the discharge of that responsibility, in fact, is a large part of the reward of professional services. On all three counts, namely, recognition of responsibility, a desire to adhere to ethical standards, and pride in the honorable discharge of responsibility, American business is rapidly becoming professional. And no businessman can hope to become a real leader today without conscious or tacit acknowledgment of that fact. On every hand evidence may be seen that the executives of our business and industrial institutions are recognizing more and more that they are professional administrators of what many of them regard as quasi-public trusts.

Aristotle said in the fourth century B.C.: "From the present mode of education we cannot determine with certainty to which men incline, whether to instruct a child in what will be useful to him

in life, or what tends to virtue, or what is excellent; for all these things have their separate defenders." Debate regarding the basic educational problems which he posed 2300 years ago is going strong today and will probably still be under way when groups like this get together a century hence. Certainly I am not presumptuous enough to believe that I can make any particular contribution to the discussion. However, when education for business and industry is under consideration, there are some significant lessons, I think, that we can draw from what has been going on for generations in the learned professions.

As we all know, schools of law, medicine, architecture, and theology frequently—in fact, usually—require a liberal education as a prerequisite to admission. This holds good even though the subject matter in each instance is largely confined to a single primary sphere. Certainly none of these professions could be more complex in its details or more far-reaching in its implications than present-day American business. Consider the variety of raw materials which modern industry requires; the multiplicity of the products that it produces; its complicated technique of manufacture and distribution; its intricate problems of finance; the countless number of people affected by its operations; the vast geographic areas covered by its activities; its effect on the general body politic—economically, sociologically, and politically. The successful solution of all these problems is of vital importance to the world at large. So, would it not be perfectly logical, speaking in collegiate terms, for the profession of business to ask a Bachelor of Arts degree of those who seek admission to its graduate work rooms where its activities are being carried out—not on any laboratory or pilot plant basis, but on the grand scale of actual practice, with the lives and happiness of millions of human beings at stake? Of course, there is no such requirement and never could be in real life, but nevertheless American industry and commerce should and must look to our colleges and universities in an increasing degree to provide its future leaders.

After all, what is the essential difference between one industrial organization and another making similar goods; one commercial house and its competitor? All, in essence, have the same sort of bricks, mortar, machinery, tools, materials, and working capital,

and all employ human beings. Whether one forges ahead and another stands still or drops behind is determined in the last analysis simply by the quality of the brains in the one institution as compared with the other, coupled with the capacity to use those brains at the right time. The success or failure of every business enterprise is traceable to one source, and one source only, namely, somebody's mind, for no one has yet invented a machine that can think. And the present economic and political confusion at home and abroad constantly calls for minds of larger and larger caliber if American business and industry are to discharge their full social responsibility in this sorely troubled world.

The technique of engineering, law, medicine, and architecture is being taught effectively in professional schools because, for one reason, each of these professions concerns itself primarily with a highly specialized group of facts—in other words, with a single, well-defined, rather clearly circumscribed field of activity. Many professional schools of business have also been organized and in years to come they will doubtless wield increasing influence. I submit, however, that so vast and varied is the scope of modern business that the teaching of business *per se* presents a peculiarly difficult problem as contrasted, for example, with legal instruction. The common law, Federal and state statutes, and municipal ordinances provide the field on which the legal game is lustily played with all the rules of precedent to guide it. Corresponding methods of instruction have been adopted by leading schools of business administration. The interpretation of case data in respect to business problems, however, is confronted with very real obstacles, for the simple reason that the game of business is played on a field that has no metes and bounds—apart from legal restrictions—save those imposed by the limits of human ingenuity and perseverance. No two business problems ever present exactly the same characteristics. Differences in personnel, in manufacturing methods, in distribution procedures; differences in price levels, profit margins, financial strength, competitive conditions, corporate spirit—all merge in a constantly changing kaleidoscope which makes the solution of today the problem of tomorrow.

After all, the real professional school of business is found directly in the field of industrial and commercial life. Its permutations

and combinations are unlimited in number; its pharmacopoeia is not stocked with standard remedies; its ruling statutes cannot be crystallized in codified form; its practice and procedure cannot be reduced to the mathematical equations of engineering formulae; its charts and compasses and chronometers cannot be synchronized. Could there be any better reasons than these why education of exceptional breadth and length and depth is required to sail its uncharted courses?

III

Here, it seems to me, we approach the kernel of the whole question of the value of a liberal education for business and industry. As President Lowell of Harvard University said years ago: "Dealing with the concrete does not lead to knowledge of the abstract." The inability to see a situation in the large, the hesitancy of the vocationally trained mind to indulge in flights of imagination and thereby enlarge its scope are not infrequently the result of the centripetal influence of professional education too closely focussed and too narrowly applied. Lowell was right: "Dealing with the concrete does not lead to knowledge of the abstract." Consequently, we see too often electricians instead of electrical engineers; surveyors instead of civil engineers; mechanics instead of mechanical engineers; conveyancers and pettifogging attorneys instead of lawyers; hack writers instead of real journalists; draftsmen instead of architects; pedagogues instead of professors; and impersonal, hair-splitting specialists instead of the old family doctor who was capable of sizing up a patient as a human being, not as a conglomeration of separate organs and glands! So by all means let us go as far as we can in the teaching of business as a profession, but in the same breath let us realize the vital importance of resourcefulness, constructive imagination, and vision in modern business; then intensify the development of these characteristics through the broad stimulus that a liberal education affords.

Huxley said that a liberally educated man has an intellect which "is a clear, cold, logic engine, with all its parts of equal strength, and in smooth working order; ready . . . to be turned to any kind of work, and spin the gossamers as well as forge the anchors of the

mind." Everett Dean Martin asserts that the distinguishing characteristics of a liberally educated man are: emancipation from herd opinion, self-mastery, the capacity for self-criticism, suspended judgment and urbanity. In my own thinking I came to the conclusion years ago that any man could claim to be liberally educated—whether he attended college or not—if he had, first, a storehouse of facts; second, trained his mind to think straight; third, acquired mental humility; and fourth, developed within himself a sense of the fitness of things which we in business call judgment.

A storehouse of facts: I mention this first because it seems to me that perhaps it is the least important in itself. Certainly, however, no man can lay claim to being liberally educated unless he has stowed away in his mind a certain mass of information about men and things. In my own case I have never had occasion to use for any practical purposes what little I ever knew about binomial theorems, integral calculus, the periodic law in chemistry, the Mendelian theory of inheritance, the choral odes in Greek tragedies, the scanning of Latin verse, the quantitative theory of money, the intricacies of Anglo-Saxon roots, the history of the Hyksos kings in Egypt, or the details of the plot of *Othello*—but all have affected my enjoyment of life and I am sure have aided me in developing any bit of mental resourcefulness or imagination that I may possess.

The ability to think straight: How rare an accomplishment and yet how vitally important if a man is to succeed in any business or profession. If education has failed to give a businessman the ability to analyze a given problem, that is, to break down the facts in any situation so that he can see the component parts clearly; and then to synthesize, to put together the clearly revealed facts as they stand out before him, in the proper patterns to form new concepts leading to logical conclusions, then I maintain that he can lay no just claim to being a really educated man. The mental discipline of a liberal education helps substantially in the acquirement of such ability.

Mental humility: If I were asked to pick out the one paramount benefit that a liberal education should bestow on a business man, I should place mental humility—tolerance for other people's

opinions—above all others. My personal observation indicates that the so-called self-made man finds this factor of tolerance more difficult to acquire than any other characteristic of a liberally educated mind. It is not surprising that this should be the case, because the man who has had to learn all of his lessons in the bitter school of experience naturally is prone to reason that, having achieved his goal, the only road by which it can be attained is the one particular route that he has laboriously travelled. As a matter of fact, his course may have been a very devious one, full of blind alleys from which he extricated himself only by the time-hallowed, trial-and-error method. Someone else, meanwhile, may have found a far better road to the same objective, just as we see today the crooked highways of the past being straightened out for the dense motor transport of the future. Nothing could be more fatal to mental progress than such an attitude. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing. So one of the invariable requirements of a liberal education should be that the student pursue at least one subject far enough to realize how little he ever can hope to know about it when he compares his own knowledge with that of the real master minds in that particular field.

I recall vividly how this realization first was thrust upon me, thanks to my old professor of mathematics at the University of Missouri. Like most youngsters I had studied arithmetic, algebra, plane geometry, and trigonometry in high school. When I went to college I thought that I might eventually want to be an engineer. Hence I elected all of the work in mathematics required for the first two years of engineering as a part of my liberal arts course, including spherical trigonometry, analytical geometry, higher algebra, and differential and integral calculus. Then just as I began to think that I was really getting somewhere as a mathematician, my old professor called forcibly to my attention the fact that I had not even touched the field of applied mathematics: thermodynamics, hydromechanics, rigid dynamics, adiabatics, permutations and combinations, the theory of probabilities, the kinetical theory of gases, let alone celestial mechanics; that compared with a Descartes or Laplace, my acquaintance with mathematics was that of an infant scarcely able to lisp!

I could not solve an equation in integral calculus today if my

life depended on it, but I tell you that nothing has ever happened to me that did more to mold my adult mental outlook than that experience. So whatever else you college administrators may do to your budding businessmen, I hope you will compel them to pursue at least one subject well beyond its elementary stages to a point where there will come upon them with the burst of an exploding shell an overwhelming sense of their own mental limitations, because that is the attitude in business that produces mental humility, open-mindedness, and the spirit of inquiry and tolerance. "Knowledge is proud that it knows so much; wisdom is humble that it knows no more." Cowper's adage applies with peculiar force to those of us in business and industry. The closed mind of the businessman who thinks he knows it all insulates him from the constructive suggestions and criticisms of his associates and thereby paves the way for his own ultimate failure.

A sense of the fitness of things: When I refer to a sense of the fitness of things as being one of the characteristics of a liberally educated man, I am thinking not merely of urbanity—the ability to conduct one's self under any given set of circumstances as a gentleman. My underlying thought goes further than that and applies with equal force to a man's moral fiber. A sense of the fitness of things, as I employ the term, is not mere social polish or intellectual veneer. It permeates a man's whole being. It leads him intuitively to reject the spurious and the false, to welcome the genuine and the true; to repulse baseness and vulgarity, and welcome nobility and refinement in thought, emotion, and action. There is a Hindu saying that "Knowledge, like water, takes the form of the vessel into which it is poured." But education that does not mold the character of the human receptacle, spiritually and morally, is readily transformed into lethal poison for the individual and social dynamite for the body politic.

IV

Our gross neglect of liberal education for the past three generations is principally responsible for the social dynamite that lies all around us in fearful proximity to the lighted fuses of domestic demagogues and foreign fanatics bent on the destruction of our

free institutions. With fatuous complacency we have steadily cut ourselves off from the intellectual and spiritual sources from which our freedom stems: the Greek philosophy of what constitutes a good life; the ancient Roman concept of civic virtue based on a government of laws, not of men; the Christian ideal of the infinite worth of the individual in the eyes of a Sovereign God, which all of the collectivists deny.

These basic principles are the well springs of the liberal tradition from which flows our triune system of constitutional representative democracy, private competitive business, and civil and religious freedom. Liberal education in the classic sense of that phrase is the sole source from which these fountainheads of American freedom can be renewed. For well-nigh a century now we have been placing less and less emphasis on the study of religion and classical history; the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle; the writings of Cicero; the works of the great English political theorists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and the profound discussions of political philosophy by the founders of our own nation.

On the other hand, we have constantly given more and more emphasis to the physical side of life, forgetting that "dealing with the concrete does not lead to knowledge of the abstract." We have thereby lost the crusading faith in our free institutions which characterized the early days of this Republic. Meanwhile, the virus of collectivism turned loose on the world by Karl Marx in 1848 has done its fateful work. A host of our own people have fallen victims and, wittingly or unwittingly, have become carriers of its deadly infection into our churches, schools, and labor organizations, and even into our government itself. The cancer of state socialism has already eaten far deeper into the American body politic than most of us realize.

The only possible cure is a sweeping and speedy revival of the type of liberal education for which our colleges and universities were so noted in the early days of the Republic. A well-informed, articulate, courageous citizenry is indispensable to the maintenance of political, intellectual, economic, and spiritual freedom. Hence, liberal education for business and industry will be indeed a hollow mockery if it does not include the broadest possible under-

standing of, and training in, the responsibilities of citizenship in a Republic of free men.

There are rich personal dividends too in a "liberal education for business and industry." As he approaches the meridian of life, the mind of the businessman naturally turns more and more to the significance of what he is here for, of what his education and experience mean in terms of individual satisfaction and happiness. The current runs swiftly; each passing year seems to go more rapidly. Before we know it, the tides of life run their course, and we either pass swiftly into the world to come with the dying words of Cecil Rhodes on our lips, "So much to do, so little done," or sit quietly for a little while and watch the stream of human life sweep by on its inevitable march to the end of time.

As those rare moments come in the midst of the turmoil and pressure of modern industry when the business leader can lay aside his burden of responsibility, he finds in a well-stocked mind, a mind that has been educated in the most truly liberal sense, a source of joy and inward satisfaction that the world of activity and stress and strain cannot give. In short, a liberal education yields dividends of mental pleasure and spiritual joy in one's riper years that nothing else—neither money, nor position, nor power—can supply. No matter how harshly or how kindly time may deal with him, so long as he retains his mental faculties, nothing can take from such a man the inner peace, the kindly stimulus, the joy of quiet hours of meditation that proceed from a mind that has garnered a storehouse of facts and has cultivated unceasingly the capacity to appreciate the good, the beautiful, and the true.

Be with me, Beauty, for the fire is dying,
My dog and I are old, too old for roving;
Man, whose young passion sets the spindrift flying,
Is soon too lame to march, too cold for loving.

* * *

I cannot sail your seas, I cannot wander
Your mountains, nor your downlands, nor your valleys
Ever again, nor share the battle yonder
Where your young knight the broken squadron rallies.
Only stay quiet, while my mind remembers
The beauty of fire from the beauty of embers.

—JOHN MASEFIELD

NEGLECTED AREAS IN EDUCATION¹

By OLIVER C. CARMICHAEL

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Despite the voluminous literature dealing with curriculum, methods, goals, administration, financing and staffing of education, a survey of the educational landscape reveals barren spots that continue to warrant examination. It is the purpose of this paper to consider a number of these by discussing each of several discrete though related topics in some detail, with the hope of emphasizing certain neglected factors and of pointing up considerations that deserve attention.

Consideration of Basic Issues

In his *Crisis in the University*, Sir Walter Moberly suggests that the university no longer asks "the really fundamental questions." If that is true for Great Britain, it is even more so in the United States, where the philosophical approach is less in evidence. But what does the suggestion mean, and is it valid? Perhaps we may find the answer to this query by examining the methods of instruction now used in some of the subjects taught in our colleges and universities.

Take history, for example. Treatises on the philosophy of history, such as those of Arnold Toynbee, Oswald Spengler, or H. G. Wells, undoubtedly raise fundamental questions, and these books are found in most libraries. But their presence on library shelves does not mean that they affect methods of instruction in the classroom. They are not generally adopted as textbooks. At most they may be assigned as collateral reading. If infrequently a professor makes greater use of these and other such writings, it is still true that most teachers of history rely mainly on far less controversial material.

¹ Reprinted from the Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, for the year ending June 30, 1952, through the courtesy of the author.

The average history text which so often determines the tone of classroom instruction is chiefly a recital of facts. It may betray certain biases of the author, but in general it is objective, non-controversial, a record of events. It recounts what happened—may even indicate how it happened—but often fails to ask, why it happened, what the meaning is, or what were the social, political, economic, or psychological factors that served as a background. This gets into the realm of opinion, and in this scientific age scholarship and instruction shun the speculative, cling to the solid ground of facts, venturing only tentative conclusions since all the facts are not in hand. The real issues are frequently sidestepped because no scientific proof is possible.

Economics likewise explains the processes involved in the exchange of goods and services, the principles that operate in that exchange, the history of the changes in those processes that have occurred in the life of organized society, and the different systems that have developed. Essentially it consists of an objective analysis and classification of observable facts with minor emphasis on the philosophy out of which economic systems are evolved and by which they operate.

This does not mean that all professors of economics handle merely the dry bones of their subject. The method of presenting subject matter may raise questions and evoke spirited class discussion, but two questions still remain: In classes where the lecture method dominates, is the time left for consideration of problems adequate; and, do basic issues receive the attention which they deserve even where discussion has superseded the lecture as the method of instruction? An effort to answer these two questions would probably reveal serious weaknesses in most classroom performances.

The same applies likewise to the other social sciences. In sociology, for example, the concern is to analyze the elements of social organization, to comprehend the principles of human and social relations, the background of social institutions, the structure of society as observed in the study of its operation, the control and interplay of forces within it. The question as to what constitutes the *good society* is passed over lightly since nobody knows the answer. Such generalizations are too vague. Thus, the emphasis

is placed on facts which may or may not be really important. In this deference to the scientific method, the real issues are often not adequately recognized.

In a recent symposium on goals for political science much discussion revolved around *indoctrination*. One speaker contended that any effort at inculcation of values must be described by that unsavory word. Another urged that "the teacher of introductory political science should. . . speak out boldly for the values that most of us accept as democratic, liberal and rational in the best sense of those words." Still another suggested that "we cannot avoid 'manipulation' of some sort," arguing that, "the very nature of the teaching process requires that we establish a frame of reference for discussion."

The purpose of citing this instance is not to comment on the problem of objectivity in teaching, but to illustrate the point that in political science the question as to the propriety of seeking to answer basic questions is a matter of current debate.

In literature the goal is certainly understanding, appreciation, and inspiration. Even there the analytical approach in considering a poem, a short story, an essay, or a novel is sometimes so emphasized as to obscure the deeper insights. Footnotes to the masterpiece of literature seem sometimes to attract more attention than the classic itself, with the result that the student may lose a budding taste for good literature rather than develop it. This sacrifice which the humanities make to the "scientific method" has been observed too frequently. Vivisection of a vital work of art, whether it be a poem, a picture, or a musical composition may result in the death of the masterpiece so far as the student is concerned.

Insistence upon observing and recording the facts, which began with the Renaissance, has been responsible for the major advances in science since that time and is an essential part of instruction in most fields. But when observation and classification constitute not only the beginning but the end of instruction, the result is ineffective education. Where the tendency is to devote major attention to observation, to the gathering and recording of facts, to the what and the how rather than to the why of phenomena, a distressing gap in educational procedure appears.

President de Kiewiet, of the University of Rochester, himself a historian, says: "When the social sciences become merely scientific or statistical, or when the humanities become historical, they shift from their proper sphere of clarification, stimulation, and advice. Any discipline which insists on being scientific or on being backward-looking in the sense that the poorest forms of history are merely backward-looking becomes morally and socially neutral. At best it indicates a withdrawal of responsibility for the future, a studied neutrality towards the vital problems of humanity, a substitution of a sterile methodology for responsible thought."

Perhaps this is but another way of suggesting the need for raising the real issues, for instruction that is problem-centered rather than subject-matter-centered, and for focusing attention less on facts and more on their implications. Whether these needs can be met through the lecture method is doubtful. The lecturer bent upon imparting information has little time for posing questions and seeking student reaction. Quiz sections are devoted largely to testing the students' knowledge. An encouraging trend of recent years is the greater prevalence of the discussion method of instruction, which makes possible more attention to problems.

The Dynamics of Education

Failure to ask fundamental questions, concentration on knowledge rather than understanding, considering only the what and how instead of the why, and complete neutrality in instruction, are unrealistic. The dynamic quality of education is lost if the subject matter is not somehow related to life. The desire for knowledge, an important educational objective, is developed by bringing the student face to face with real problems in such way as to arouse a desire to resolve them.

It is not enough to understand the nature of justice. Teaching which fails to inculcate a "hunger and thirst after justice," as Ruskin put it, is lacking in vitality. Full knowledge of social theory in all its aspects—economic, sociological, and political—is of little use except it be accompanied by a sense of social responsibility. In the words of Aristotle, the end of philosophy is "not knowledge but action."

It is said that the cult of objectivity in American education has resulted in a generation of irresponsible intellectuals, of men without convictions. As a warning, Germany is cited. There scientific learning reached its peak, with a larger proportion of highly trained men than any other nation. Yet it was also there that the leadership, despite this exceptional scientific learning, was unable to resist a fanatic who led the nation to a ruin more tragic and more complete than that suffered by any other in modern history. And it was that same leadership that permitted a Dachau and a Buchenwald.

The implication is that education which takes a detached view of life and society, that never leads students to face issues, both personal and social, realistically, that observes neutrality in the instruction of youth tends to produce men and women who are spectators rather than actors in life's conflicts. They view both sides of the questions with equanimity, seeing the strengths and weaknesses of each, weighing the pros and cons, analyzing with clarity and logic the elements of the issues at stake, even reaching a tentative conclusion as to which side is right, but never align themselves with either of the contending forces.

Surely the effective citizen, and more particularly the leader, must be willing to stand up and be counted, to make a commitment, to throw his weight on the side of truth; in short, to enter the fight for the right as he sees it. Many of our current problems fail of solution because those who understand the needs best lack the courage to undertake the solution. It is probable that wholly neutral instruction weakens rather than strengthens the ability to make commitments, and yet an education which does not strengthen the power of conviction, that does not inculcate a sense of social responsibility, fails in its duty to society.

The absence of a clear and positive philosophy is the great weakness of the western world in its fight against Communist ideology. But the humanists and social scientists, when asked to state the foundation for our faith in the ideals on which western civilization rests, plead their inability to agree upon the fundamentals of that faith. This raises the question whether the western world will be able to excite the imaginations of men and capture their loyalties in the great debate now going on in the world if

the foundations of its faith cannot be made explicit. The uncertain witness never gives convincing testimony.

The fact is, no adequate effort has been made in our time to explore the areas of agreement or disagreement on fundamental issues. The cult of objectivity has influenced so profoundly the thinking, the attitude, the approach of scholars, that they have somehow never conceived it to be their task to provide the foundations for and the framework within which the design of western culture can be sketched. Until such an effort is made, instruction in the humanistic social studies will be handicapped. We may observe social phenomena, analyze the facts, classify the data, and thereby gain some understanding of the forces at work in modern society, but we shall not achieve a systematic and comprehensive view of social structure without a more basic approach.

The widespread criticism of current educational practices and of educators is partly a reaction to the tension of the times but probably reflects also a vague realization that something is lacking in instruction. As someone has put it, "the total effect of the new education is to leave the child. . .without a set of values." This may result from undue emphasis upon objectivity and from the fact that no systematic and comprehensive view of social structure has been formulated.

The Scientific Method and Liberal Education

Too great an emphasis on the scientific method has resulted in unwarranted departmentalization of knowledge. This, in turn, has led to a quantitative conception of education represented by the credit hour system, to the supposition that fragments of knowledge gathered by the student automatically blend into a coherent whole, thus producing a liberally educated person. In stressing analysis it fails to give sufficient attention to synthesis in the educational process. It overlooks the element to which Cardinal Newman called attention when he said, in speaking of liberal education: "Communication is not the whole process. . . . It is the action of a formative power, reducing to order and meaning the matter of our acquirements; it is making of the objects of our knowledge subjectively our own, or, to use a familiar word, it is a digestion of what we receive into the substance of our previous state of thought."

This oversight has weakened the liberal tradition and largely robbed it of its appeal. Hence, the arts college has to some extent lost its identity and its position as the dominant element in higher education. It has become more a service agency teaching the tools of learning, introducing the student to the broad fields of knowledge through elementary or watered-down survey courses, providing pre-professional courses for medicine, law, the ministry, nursing, etc., and preparing students for the graduate school through a kind of specialized training in some one field, styled his major. The broad liberalizing program in terms of which the college is usually described simply does not exist in many institutions called colleges of arts and sciences.

One of the fallacies which accounts for this fact is revealed in the confusion of the terms "subject matter fields" and "disciplines." They are not synonymous; the one refers to aggregations of facts, the other to ways of thinking. Arthur E. Bestor, in the spring issue of *The American Scholar* (1952), made this point and suggested that true education is not primarily concerned with communication of knowledge but with the communication of intellectual power. He commented further: "Academic courses which teach men to perform mathematical computations but not to think mathematically, to manipulate laboratory apparatus but not to think scientifically, to remember dates but not to think historically, to summarize philosophical arguments but not to think critically—these advance no man toward liberal education." One of the most common errors is the assumption that by some magic a series of discrete subjects mastered by a student will fuse automatically to produce an educated person. It is symbolized by the substitution of "subject matter fields" for "disciplines" in current educational discussions.

While the acquisition of facts adds to one's knowledge, it may not contribute to understanding. Learning unimportant facts or failure to interpret significant ones is equally sterile. The requirement of more course reading matter than the student can digest may retard rather than aid educational progress. The conscientious student who day after day stretches his mind to encompass a large body of material without time to reflect on it may develop bad intellectual habits and a warped judgment as to

the meaning of education. Too great emphasis upon breadth of knowledge without adequate attention to depth and meaning is a too common error.

If higher learning be concerned with understanding, with interpretation, with meaning in terms of desired goals, then scientific studies which deal simply with facts, with little reference to their relationships, scarcely measure up to the true ideal. The knowledge gained may be useful, may serve practical ends, but contributes little to the student's development. Scientific learning is an aid to progress only when pursued with the goal of understanding the world of nature and men's relation to it. In such a context scientific studies are humane or liberalizing; otherwise, they are technical. It is this distinction which sometimes has been overlooked when thinking of the sciences as an element of liberal education.

Confusion of Terms

If the average undergraduate were asked to define the highest form of intellectual activity on the university campus, he would probably reply "research." He could cite many facts in justification of the answer, and, in terms of its recognizable effect upon society, he would probably be right. But much so-called research activity, whether it be in the natural sciences, the social sciences, or the humanities, is routine. The occasional brilliant discovery which gets the headlines impresses the public with the esoteric, if not magical, powers of the scientist and creates the notion that research is the highest form of creative activity, though some of our most revolutionary discoveries have been hit upon by chance. Without in any way disparaging the importance of research, let us examine the facts.

Pursuit of the truth is undoubtedly the highest function of the university, but that is not synonymous with scientific research. It refers to search for reality, for meaning, for ultimate answers. On the other hand, scientific investigation is concerned with pursuit of knowledge, a search for facts, for proximate answers. They are but aids in the search for truth. In other words, truth is not arrived at through fact-gathering or the acquisition of knowledge alone, but through the discovery of meaning, and the interpreta-

tion of knowledge. This is a subjective process, the highest form of intellectual activity. Failure to distinguish between knowledge and its meaning, between facts and their implications, has resulted in much loose thinking. This does not imply that "tool" subjects or "service" courses have no place in the curriculum, but simply that they should be recognized as such. The truly creative courses emphasize interpretation, the implications of facts and depth of understanding.

To put the matter another way, research and the higher learning are not twins in the educational process. One is concerned with adding to the storehouse of knowledge, the other with increasing intellectual power—a developing, constructive, and creative process; its aspirations are toward ultimate answers. Research extends the boundaries of the known, but may not in itself develop one's reasoning power. In other words, nonempirical concepts which have to do with reality, with meaning, do not come from the laboratory with its test tube and beaker, but from the crucible of a vital intellectual experience. Scientific research is, in a word, concerned with phenomena; learning, in the fullest sense, with *noumena*. Failure to distinguish between the two has resulted in confusion as to the ideal of the higher learning.

Another facet of the same fallacy inheres in a misinterpretation of the phrase "spirit of inquiry." Many investigations are motivated by need for facts rather than curiosity. The enormous sums expended by business, industry, and government on research of every kind are purely practical ventures. They gamble on the ability of the researcher to discover facts useful in the promotion of the business or the industry, or, in the case of government, in advancing the cause of national defense. It would be of interest to know what percentage of the vast budget for research in the universities is devoted to *ad hoc* objectives. It is doubtless greater than that spent for all other purposes. Yet such research may serve to stifle the true spirit of inquiry. One of the disturbing questions in the American university today is whether the burden of sponsored research may not so weaken the impulse to spontaneous inquiry as to endanger the vigor of free ranging creative curiosity.

There is also a by-product of this undue emphasis on applied

research that may be harmful to the educational system in general. It may infect the undergraduate with the virus that learning is useless unless it has a demonstrable *ad hoc* purpose. Since the object of the higher learning is understanding, acquiring facts simply for their usefulness in achieving certain practical, even though worthy, objectives may be essentially a nonintellectual process.

The traditional connotation of the spirit of inquiry is search for ultimates. One cannot travel the road leading to the citadel of truth without the aid of facts, but they should be considered only as a means of facilitating progress toward the goal. Any other conception means confusing search for knowledge with the spirit of inquiry.

The Nature of Truth and the Essentials for Attaining It

Engraved in stone over the portals of many academic halls is the inscription: "Know the truth and the truth will make you free." In each case the inference is that within this hall is to be found the truth that makes men free. The idea is appealing, and apparently from the numbers attending colleges and universities the American people have a kind of blind faith in it. And yet even the educators, not to mention the lay public, have failed sometimes to comprehend its meaning or to make explicit its implications. A college of liberal arts meant originally a liberalizing or liberating agency, but the term has taken on other connotations. At least, it is scarcely associated in the public mind with the idea of truth that makes men free.

It has been thought of vaguely in terms of freedom from the shackles of ignorance and superstition, poverty and drudgery, or the dullness of a life of limited outlook and circumscribed interests. To the more thoughtful, it connotes opening of new horizons, freeing the mind to explore the world of knowledge and to push back its frontiers, giving to the individual intellectual independence and initiative. All of these connotations have merit, but they do not touch the deeper meaning embodied in the scriptural quotation. Facts, knowledge, and ideas which are but means to certain ends do not constitute truth. "Pursuit of truth for its own sake" indicates that truth is an end in itself. It is truth in that sense that makes men really free.

But the quotation so frequently cited to suggest the goal of education is incomplete. It is as follows: "If ye continue in my word, then ye are my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Omission of the qualification has led to error in educational thinking. It is not the object here to dwell upon the religious significance of the conception expressed some two thousand years ago by the founder of the Christian religion but rather to analyze its meaning and to comment on its relevance to educational theory.

Divested of its other implications, the clause referring to discipleship suggests that a commitment is involved if one would find the truth. Commitment to certain basic assumptions is a necessary starting point in the quest for truth in however limited a sense and in whatever field. The natural scientist starts with a limited number of postulates which are incapable of proof but which are essential if he is to make any headway in his work. For example, a biologist or chemist assumes in all his research uniformity in the operation of the laws of nature. Without such an assumption, experiments would be meaningless and generalization impossible. In fields where the fundamental assumptions are lacking, the validity of minor hypotheses may be tested but the value of the result is necessarily limited in scope.

This suggests again, and from a different angle, the need for explorations in the social science fields where the basic working postulates have not been formulated. The need for them is emphasized in a statement of Moberly. "No science," he says, "can get on at all without some working assumptions of postulates whose validity for the purpose of the investigation is presupposed and not proved. Some of these, such as the postulate of the uniformity of nature, are common to all the natural sciences. Others, such as the universal applicability of quantitative methods, are peculiar to a single science or a group of sciences. Their justification lies in their working; that is, in enabling the scientist to get on with his job successfully. Sooner or later, any that do not do this are discarded."

Perhaps agreement upon even a few fundamental assumptions underlying the western mode of thought and way of life would provide the background for posing the real issues and for a fruitful attack upon them.

Conclusion

Concern has been expressed on both sides of the Atlantic over the sense of frustration that seems to prevail in the college population in these postwar years.

An outstanding British educator said recently, "The haunting trouble of the student today is the very deep-seated doubt whether in the modern world so impersonal and so insecure, his life can have any significance. Existing university courses do little to reassure or to stimulate him." Something of the same thought was expressed by a distinguished American university president who said: "What we need with an urgency beyond the power of the gravest words to reveal, is far greater wisdom and understanding to lead our generation out of the persuasion that it is adrift on seas too deep for anchorage. . . . I know of no more serious task for that branch of politics which we call education than to move against the spirit of fatalism which is so clearly discernible in colleges and universities."

How education could go about performing this task is not clear, but perhaps attention to some of the neglected areas referred to might help.

If a sense of futility, insecurity, and fatalism does prevail among college and university students, it means presumably that they are groping for light on the really important issues. In such cases considerations of lesser matters would fail to satisfy. Certainly instruction that seeks complete objectivity is not likely to touch the springs of motivation. It could easily add to rather than subtract from a sense of frustration. By the same token an education which concentrates on scientific analysis with little or no emphasis on synthesis is not likely to evoke an active response nor resolve a deep-seated doubt about the meaning of life. Certainly, confusing facts with the truth, research with learning, and the search for knowledge with the spirit of inquiry is designed to disturb one who seeks ultimate answers rather than to allay his fears.

The thoughtful student is in search of truth. In times of stress the effort is intensified. If he fails to find satisfaction in his quest, the result is a sense of insecurity if not of futility. This seems to indicate that consideration of the nature of truth and the essentials for attaining it should receive greater attention in educational procedure. Just that has been the underlying theme of this essay.

A NINETEENTH-CENTURY ACADEMIC CAUSE CÉLÈBRE¹

BY ELIZABETH DONNAN

Wellesley College

Harassed by world-wide conflicts of doctrine, by fears and indecisions, by wars and rumors of wars, we today are tempted to regard the closing years of the nineteenth century as years of untroubled serenity. Not so did they appear to their own generation. Falling prices, business depression, threats of a growing monopoly of power, and distrust of the existing currency, created an atmosphere far from placid. Symptoms of widespread uneasiness were to be discerned in academic communities as well as in the business world. With increasing frequency it was alleged that no opponent of "sound money" or of spread of the trusts could retain his place as an instructor of college youth. The removal of an advocate of municipal ownership of utilities from the faculty of the University of Chicago, the dismissal of a friend of free silver from Marietta College, and the enforced transfer of a professor from the department of economics to that of social science at Stanford University, were all accounted evidences of the domination of wealth. On the other hand, it was charged that two instructors at the University of Missouri, and the president of a Kansas institution had lost their places because of their opposition to free silver. These interferences with academic freedom, if such they were, failed to arouse much general interest. It was not until that freedom seemed threatened in one of its traditional strongholds—in a university in a state proud to refer its beginnings to Roger Williams—that the threat excited wide attention.

From a bundle of newspaper clippings, ready to disintegrate at a touch, the story of this threat can still be read. An aftermath of the bitter presidential campaign of 1896, it concerns the trus-

¹ Reprinted through the courtesy of the author and the *New England Quarterly* Vol. XXV, No. 1, March, 1952 issue.

tees, the president, the faculty, and the alumni of Brown University, as well as a large and interested public.¹

In 1889 Brown, up to that time a small Rhode Island college with no great influence outside the state, needed a new president. The comfortable and placid regime of Dr. Ezekiel G. Robinson had ended, and the corporation believed that the time had come to improve the educational opportunities of the young people of Rhode Island, and to extend the influence of the college to a wider area. The president chosen was Elisha Benjamin Andrews, a Brown alumnus, who had served for a short time as president of Denison University, had taught at Brown, and at the time of his election was a professor of political economy at Cornell University. The choice was a happy one. Under him the student body more than trebled, the woman's college was incorporated in the university, the income increased, and promising young scholars were brought to the faculty. It was evident that an educational institution was being created of which the city of Providence and the state of Rhode Island could be proud. In June, 1896, President Andrews, exhausted by seven years of unremitting labor, was given a year's leave of absence, and when the corporation gathered for its June meeting in 1897, he had not yet returned to this country.

This corporation, in which the government of the college was vested by the charter of 1764, consisted of two bodies: a board of trustees and a board of fellows. The presiding officer of the board of trustees, elected by the corporation every three years, was for his term the chancellor of the university. The president of the university presided over the fellows. In 1897 there were on that board, in addition to the president, four clergymen, three lawyers, two manufacturers, and one physician. One vacancy existed, the result of the failure of Richard Olney to accept the place to which he had been elected. The board of trustees contained twelve manufacturers, eight lawyers, seven merchants, six clergymen, one teacher, one physician, and one hotel proprietor. Of the fellows, nine were from New England and the same number were

¹ All the material here used is to be found in the collection of clippings and letters made by Dr. J. Franklin Jameson during the summer of 1897 and now among the Jameson Papers in the hands of Dr. Leo F. Stock, through whose generosity the writer has had access to them.

graduates of Brown University. In the larger body, twenty-eight or twenty-nine were graduates of Brown; twenty-five lived in New England. As they gathered in June, 1897, they appear to have been a group of worried men. With the expansion of the college, expenses had grown and few gifts had come to swell the endowment. At the moment there may have been disappointment that the commencement celebration had brought no largesse from John D. Rockefeller, whose son was in the graduating class.

Among the members of the corporation there were, also, those who were even more disturbed about the finances of the nation than about those of the college. Many men had been badly frightened by the campaign of 1896 and were not reassured by the Republican victory. They firmly believed that the coinage of silver at the suggested ratio of 16 to 1 would spell national ruin. Some appreciation of their anxiety over college finances and of their alarm over the spread of Bryanism in the nation is necessary if we are to understand how a group containing many men genuinely interested in the well-being of Brown University allowed it to be placed in the unenviable position which it occupied during the summer of 1897.

II

Most of the business of the meeting of June 16 had been transacted when Joseph Walker, a Worcester manufacturer, chairman of the committee on banking and currency in the U.S. House of Representatives, spoke. Emphasizing the obvious fact that Brown needed large benefactions which it was not receiving, he offered, as the reason, President Andrews' advocacy of free silver. After some discussion, William Goddard, chancellor of the university, Francis Weyland, dean of the Yale Law School, and William Durfee, former chief justice of Rhode Island, were appointed a committee to confer with the president "in regard to the interests of the university." To many of the men present, the projected conference was probably of no great significance. They certainly had no thought of dispensing with the services of President Andrews and they intended to keep the criticism implied in the appointment of the committee to themselves. A day or two later, however, the newspapers carried a full account of the action, some

of them underscoring its possible implications. Though he denied it, it was widely believed that Congressman Walker, aggressive, opinionated, hot-tempered, and without the respect for scholarship traditional in the city of Providence, was the source of the newspaper story, and that this was the beginning of his campaign to remove President Andrews.

Walker's earlier relations with the president are significant. Some years before the corporation meeting of 1897, Walker had demanded an investigation of the textbooks used in the classes in political economy, and that the teacher of that subject, Henry B. Gardner, be brought to the corporation for questioning. When Dr. Andrews turned aside this request, Walker wrote a sharp letter to Gardner and received from him an uncompromising reply. This he presented to the president as a reason for Gardner's immediate dismissal. Failing to accomplish this end, he absented himself from the meetings of the corporation for some time, but reappeared in June, 1897, ready to attack the president.¹

The publication of the action of the corporation opened a newspaper battle which continued throughout the summer. Statements and denials, charges and countercharges, were hurled back and forth until at times the real issue seemed hopelessly obscured. The *Providence Journal* of June 19, in its long account of Walker's speech and of the resulting action, took no position, but a brief editorial two days later left no doubt as to the stand of that paper:

In these very practical days of the closing years of the nineteenth century the final test of a college President is his ability to draw funds toward the treasury of the institution over which he presides. Judged from this point of view, Dr. Andrews has been a distinct failure since his connection with Brown University and it would be absurd for him to retain his present position unless he can persuade his admirers to collect a fund of at least half a million dollars and place it at his disposal.²

On the opposite side, the *Boston Herald* charged Walker with having entered on a crusade against Dr. Andrews because of political

¹ *Providence Evening Telegram*, August 5; *Boston Herald*, August 10. All citations, both of newspapers and of letters, are for 1897.

² The *Journal* was described by one of its readers as a "respectable but crabbed sheet," which had for years "pursued Andrews with unseemly rancor."

differences. Though it had little sympathy with the views of the president on free trade or free silver, it held:

Educators who are worth very much are apt to have opinions of their own on topics of public instruction, and to be free in expressing them. If they are to be narrowed in any way by outside influence, the chances are that it will be more to the detriment of the institutions with which they are connected than of benefit to them. It will be worse if they are to be removed from their office to make place for more compliant men, and worst of all if this is to be done under politicians' auspices.¹

This drew from Mr. Walker an "amazed" letter, in which he denied that he had any idea of bringing about the resignation of the president, and averred that he did not know whether Dr. Andrews was a free trader, or whether he voted the Republican or the Democratic ticket, and that politics had no part in the matter.²

Early in July the weeklies entered the fray. In the *Independent* of July 8, Dr. Heman Weyland, brother of Dean Weyland of the committee, in an endeavor to shift the discussion from political to moral grounds, quoted Walker as saying to the corporation:

I refer to the principles which lie at the foundation of Christian civilization. Gifts to the amount of thousands or perhaps millions of dollars are withheld from the college because businessmen protest against the teachings of the President on subjects of economic morality.

On the same day, the editor of the *Examiner*, a religious weekly, wrote:

We have not agreed with all of Dr. Andrews's financial views, as we understand them; but this does not blind us to the fact that we have in him one of our ablest thinkers and foremost educators, a man of rare executive ability, of deep religious convictions and of strong personal magnetism. The growth of the university under his wise direction has been truly marvelous.

¹ *Boston Herald*, June 22.

² *Boston Herald*, June 25. The newspapers at first included the views of Dr. Andrews on the tariff among his obnoxious heresies but defenders of the corporation were quick to deny that his belief in free trade was counted against him. "Protection is a subject on which it is felt that wise and honest men may differ; but the free coinage of silver at the rate of 16 to 1, with an unlimited quantity of legal tender, is a crime against arithmetic, against common sense, against morality." Heman Weyland, *Independent*, July 8. Dr. Weyland's father, a former president of Brown, had been a well-known free trader.

Dr. Andrews arrived in Providence on June 30.¹ Shortly after his return he suggested to the members of the committee that they put in writing what they wished to discuss. This was done and on July 16 they met with him. On the seventeenth, he sent his resignation to the executive committee of the corporation, and on July 22 he gave to the press the letter of the committee and his letter of resignation. From that date until September 1, he seems to have taken no part in the ensuing controversy.² The letter of the committee began with words of praise for the work accomplished by Dr. Andrews and was freighted with expressions of warm personal regard. It then asked for one future change, "this having reference to his views upon a question which constituted the leading issue in the recent Presidential election, and which is still predominate in national politics." It was the belief of the committee that the opinions of the president concerning silver coinage were so contrary to those generally held by friends of the university that the university had already lost gifts and legacies which otherwise would have come to it. The president was not asked to renounce his views, but to cease to promulgate them. Dr. Andrews replied that he could not meet the desires of the committee without surrendering "that reasonable liberty of utterance which my predecessors, my faculty colleagues and myself have hitherto enjoyed, and in the absence of which the most ample endowment for an educational institution would have but little worth."³

III

Before pursuing the fresh burst of newspaper comment brought forth by these letters, it is necessary to consider the facts on which the criticism of the president rested. For many years he had been an ardent believer in international bimetallism. His views on this

¹ Two members of his faculty, J. Franklin Jameson and Henry B. Gardner, conferred with the president on the afternoon of his return. Jameson wrote to his father that Andrews had known nothing of the affair until that day.

² This statement rests on negative evidence only. One action of the president, though it came to nothing, greatly embarrassed his supporters. John Brisbane Walker of the *Cosmopolitan* was planning a glorified correspondence school and Dr. Andrews gave provisional consent to act as its head. It was commonly believed that this was to be a propaganda agency for free silver and even the president's friends felt that his commitment at this time was, to say the least, indiscreet.

³ *Providence Journal*, July 23.

subject were well known when he was called to Brown. In 1892 he had been appointed a delegate to the Brussels conference on international bimetallism by President Harrison. Until the spring of 1896 he had not advocated a double monetary standard for the United States alone but before he left the country that summer, in answer to inquiries from Brown alumni, he had twice written of his conviction that this country could safely establish a double standard and that other nations would follow. These letters had been published by their recipients and had been widely quoted. Many of his detractors made no distinction between international bimetallism, for which he had spoken, and free silver, for which he had not spoken. That he could have taken no active part in the campaign of 1896 is obvious, since he was absent from the country. A second charge made against President Andrews was that he taught his heresies to college classes, even though his professorship was in philosophy, not political economy. As the controversy progressed, he was accused of rushing into print in order to pose as a martyr; he was also blamed for sending his resignation to the papers before presenting it to the university authorities. His friends protested that the action of the corporation had been well aired in many papers while President Andrews was still in London, and that his resignation was in the hands of the executive committee of the corporation almost a week before it was made public.¹

The first period of newspaper debate dealt with the action of the corporation and its implications; the second, with the letter of the committee and the resignation of the president. The *Boston Herald*, the *Globe*, the *Traveller*, the *Springfield Republican*, the *Providence Telegram*, the *New Haven Register*, and the *Baltimore Sun*, all agreed that no self-respecting man could have done other than resign, though a number of them vigorously repudiated what they believed to be the views of Dr. Andrews on monetary questions. The editor of the *Herald* observed on July 24:

This was in effect to say that the pecuniary question was paramount in providing for an institution of instruction—that it was of less consequence that a man should be able, pure, upright, conscientious in his position as an instructor than that he should bring

¹ Letters from Professor Gardner, *Providence Journal*, July 27; *Boston Herald*, July 30, August 6; *New York Evening Post*, August 24.

money to the college from certain people who would not provide it unless the man at its head agreed with their views in politics. Here is an attempt to subordinate the independence of the scholar which should be resented not alone by scholars themselves, but by all who respect scholarship.

Those who defended the committee offered various arguments. Some believed that any man who espoused the cause of free silver was unfit to be a college president, and the more quickly Andrews was removed the better for Brown and for the country; others felt that Andrews had betrayed his calling by introducing politics into academic halls; while still others maintained that the corporation had no choice because the president was depriving the university of funds essential to its existence. The *Chicago Tribune* of July 24 ended a diatribe with these words:

Andrews is either a hopeless crank or a creature without a conscience and without the least perception of the difference between right and wrong. The best thing he can do, now he is out of a place he has occupied too long, is to migrate to New York, join Tammany, and get it to make him its official lecturer and teacher of financial dishonesty and legalized repudiation.

The *New York Sun* of July 26 took a somewhat lofty view:

The college world should be kept free from disturbance by political asperities, in order that it may be occupied solely by calm and unpartisan learning and scholarship. It is not a place proper for political controversy. That battle should be waged outside a domain wherein scholarly repose should reign.

One vehement supporter of the committee, recognizing that it had blundered in its bald statement of a mercenary motive, wrote that the crafty Andrews had, by asking for a written statement, laid a trap for three practical men less skilled in writing than he was. The three "practical men," it will be remembered, were the dean of the Yale Law School, an ex-judge, and the chancellor of Brown.

Among the weeklies, the *Christian Register*, the *Examiner*, the *Outlook*, the *Congregationalist*, wholeheartedly condemned the letter of the committee, the *Outlook* commenting that the Brown trustees had confirmed the charges of those critics in the campaign of 1896 who had declared that no college professor was free to express doctrines unpalatable to the rich.¹

¹ *Outlook*, July 31, 779.

The discussion was not confined to this country. Early in August the *London Daily Chronicle* pointed to dire consequences if millionaires were to be allowed to control American education, and described the dismissal of President Andrews as a blow at "social, economic, and intellectual liberty" in America. The *Spectator* of July 31 saw excellent grounds for thinking that the trusts had determined to control the teaching of economics in the universities of the United States. "The divine right of Kings is to be succeeded by the divine right of millionaires, who are to run everything including the American Senate and the conscience and intellect of University professors."

Professors J. Franklin Jameson and Henry B. Gardner were the most articulate of the faculty members to become involved in the controversy. When the account of the action of the corporation appeared in the papers, they met at least twice with certain of their colleagues to discuss some form of protest, but so carefully were these meetings guarded that the alert and inquisitive *Providence Journal* could report only that there were rumors of such meetings. Rumor had it that Professor Jameson had presented so strong a remonstrance that some members had withdrawn from the meeting, while others declared they would sign nothing which might reflect on the wisdom of the trustees. Some of these rumors are confirmed by letters from Dr. Jameson to his family. His indignation in a note of June 23 is so outspoken that one can believe in the reported reluctance of his more timid colleagues to sign his note of protest. He told his family: "It will be a bad state of things for us all if a lot of conceited parvenues like Joe Walker, who get put on boards of trustees simply because they are rich, can dictate to us what we shall say both inside and outside the college." A week later, after a conference with President Andrews, Jameson wrote: "Whether the faculty will both concur in my manifesto and think it wise to promulgate it I do not know. I shall not be clear of its wisdom myself for a day or two, certainly." On July 9 he wrote:

The triumviri will meet him soon, perhaps today. My expectation that, after all that has been said, they will roar very gently, has diminished. I fear they will put pressure on him. In that case there will be a fight. The faculty, I am glad to say, are mostly de-

terminated to stand by him and to stand up for freedom of speech. This is all private at present. We want to keep the peace if Andrews feels, after the interview, that the Corporation did not mean to put restrictions upon him. So we say nothing about the meeting we had the other day, at which I read a somewhat detailed address to the alumni I had prepared. It was almost universally approved by those now in town, and nearly all would sign it in the contingency mentioned. Probably it might first be recast slightly, and take the form of an open letter sent during vacation to the members of the Corporation and to all the alumni. Gardner and I have been taking the chief part in the thing and he is so very prudent and temperate a man that I am confirmed in my feeling that the only course is some such protest. Apart from the question of right, it would be very injurious for the college to have Andrews resign or to have it supposed that he has been put under bonds. For that matter he never would be but I think they will try it. . . . I believe that if necessary we can at least work upon the alumni enough to prevent Andrews from being forced to resign, if that is the design. I don't think it is the plan of most of the board, but it is of some, and they will work hard between now and September 2.

IV

Once the resignation of the president was known, the protest, now in the form of an open letter to the corporation, was completed and signed by twenty-four of the thirty-seven members of the faculty who held the rank of associate professor or professor. Nine refused to sign; others could not be reached. On July 31 it was sent to the members of the corporation and given to the press. Widely quoted at the time, many sections of it deserve to be read today. After a careful statement of their understanding of the action of the corporation and of the committee and of their appreciation of the fact that the corporation had had no intention of making the matter public, the signers of the letter expressed their strong dissent from the theory on which these actions rested, the theory that "the material growth of a university is of more importance than independence of thought and expression on the part of its president and professors, and that boards of trustees have, as such, the right to suggest limitations upon such independence." The protesting members of the faculty declared that they did not believe this to be the theory of the members of the corporation, but since the public thought otherwise, they begged the corporation to

take such action as would clear Brown University in the eyes of the world.

Though the author and signers of the letter believed pecuniary considerations to be of subordinate importance, they raised them in order to dismiss them. While it was true that the endowment had not increased, the larger body of students under President Andrews had more than doubled the income of the university. Brown had never received large benefactions and that such gifts would have come had the president held different views was an unproved assumption, especially since gifts to all New England colleges had slackened during the nineties. Then, reverting to the early editorial of the *Providence Journal*, the letter continued:

But those who are accustomed to observe and reflect upon the issues of university education, those who have felt its value and perceived the real source of its power, know well that the final test is at the end of the century what it was at the beginning of the century, what it has been in all preceding centuries—the existence or the non-existence of that personal power which, with money or without money, can take hold of an institution and lift it from a lower to a higher plane, which can seize upon the imaginations and the moral natures of young men and transform them into something more scholarly, manly and noble.¹

On the usual arguments for freedom of speech the writer did not feel it necessary to dwell, least of all in Rhode Island, where "the right to such freedom has for two hundred and sixty years been cherished with peculiar jealousy," but two questions, he believed, called for consideration: Should one be allowed freedom to express opinions adverse to those of the most influential members of the community? Was a college president called upon to *represent* the views of his trustees or of his community? To the first question the response was that, from Milton's day till the present, experience had shown that the attempt to suppress doctrines only gave them added strength. "Even though the doctrines of free silver be the blackest and most foolish of heresies we do the commonwealth no service if we attempt by official pressure to close up their channels of expression." As to the second question:

¹ *The Andrews Controversy* (Providence, 1897), 17. This pamphlet contains letters, memorials, and protests which were presented to the corporation during the summer or at its September meeting.

It is not the proper function of a university to "represent" or to advocate any favored set of political, any more than of religious doctrines, but rather to inspire young men with the love of truth and knowledge and, with freedom and openness of mind, to teach how these are to be obtained.

The letter ended with cogent words on the injury which would be inflicted on Brown University should the students or the public have reason to suspect that the president and the professors were not free to speak freely on public questions. "The life blood of a university is not money but freedom."

During the period in which this document was circulating within the faculty three main groups emerged: a small number who so intensely abhorred the monetary views of the president that they gave warm approval to the action of the corporation; a few who deprecated the action of the corporation but believed that it was the height of impertinence for the faculty to protest; and many who considered it their duty to speak against this infringement of academic liberty.

Once the open letter was published there followed a third period of lively newspaper discussion. The *Journal*, on August 3, remarked that a

more injudicious utterance than the one made public yesterday could hardly be imagined, and the affixing of the senior professor's name to a document he could never have seen certainly requires full explanation.¹ A college might as well be run by a town meeting as by having a portion of the faculty enter into public arguments with the governing body.

The *Chicago Tribune* of August 7 was even more violent in its condemnation:

Their youth, their ignorance, and the fact that they owed their places to the ex-President may serve to explain their course. . . . These teachings of Andrews are rotten with dishonesty. They would reflect discredit on the dark ages and on barbarians. Where in the world is there a college which cherishes among its "priceless traditions" one to the effect that it taught that swindling was a

¹ This is a reference to the signature of Benjamin F. Clark, who had been acting president of the university during the absence of President Andrews and who was at this time in Ireland whence he had cabled that his name was to be affixed to the protest.

virtue and honesty a mistake? . . . Ignorance is doubtless the explanation of the backing up of a knavish chief by deluded professors. They would do better to investigate another time before meddling with matters they do not understand.

To a number of papers it was clear that a college should be managed as was a railroad, a bank, or a factory. An unsatisfactory college president should be discharged just as an unsatisfactory street-car driver. The height of disapproval was reached by the *Mail and Express* in an editorial of August 3:

The corporation of Brown University, when it meets to accept the resignation of President Andrews, should not hesitate to demand as well the resignations of those members of the faculty who sympathize with the wish of Dr. Andrews to pervert a great and broad institution of learning to the advocacy of a single theory of finance.

Approval of the protest, however, predominated. Even the *New York Evening Post*, which had up to this time staunchly supported the corporation, modified its position. The *Chicago Record*, the *News*, the *Chronicle*, the *Hartford Post*, the *Portland Press*, the *Fall River Herald*, the *New York Journal*, the *Daily News*, the *Boston Traveller*, *Herald*, and *Advertiser*, the *Manchester Union*, the *Springfield Republican*, and the *Providence Telegram*, all lauded the document. On August 4 a writer in the *New York Journal* observed:

To have remained silent would have been tacitly to confess that they [the members of the faculty] each and all stood ready to suppress any individual opinions, to let evil pass without rebuke, or good suffer without defence, in consideration of their monthly wage.

Possibly the greatest enthusiasm came from the *Boston Herald* of August 5:

It is an admirable document in every respect—admirable in its reasoning, felicitous in the manner in which its points are made, most of all to be commended for the noble spirit which pervades it.

The *Transcript*, failing to share the enthusiasm of the *Herald*, maintained that the entire matter was a private one which should never have been brought to public discussion. This drew from

Edwin D. Mead, then and always a doughty champion of freedom, a plea for academic liberty in which he wrote:

This paper, signed by the professors of Brown University, is the most important paper which has appeared in this country in the last ten years, the paper fullest of hope and promise for the next ten years.

To this the *Transcript* retorted:

When it [free speech] is indulged in to the detriment of a class or an interest that the user was appointed to benefit it seems time for the relation to terminate.¹

The letter from Mead was but one of many which merit quotation, both because of the sentiments expressed and the position and influence of the writers. One of the most thoughtful was that of Josiah Royce.² With the views of Dr. Andrews on silver he had small sympathy but, in this case "reasonable liberty" of utterance was at stake. Such liberty he considered to be by no means unlimited.

We who teach in universities are "reasonably" required to be very careful and considerate, both as to the manner and as to the matter of our public utterances. We are so required because we are supposed to try to think deliberately, to learn dispassionately, and to express ourselves with responsibility.

If the question were whether or not the president of Brown University had shown himself unworthy of the confidence of his colleagues, Professor Royce declared he would not have ventured to express his opinion. But that was not the issue. The letter of the committee had expressly declared him to be an excellent president. He was asked, however, to suppress such views as might injure the cash box of the university.

Both the profession and the general public are profoundly interested in knowing whether the honor of our academic calling is to be tarnished by the toleration of a doctrine such as could alone justify the committee's letter. And there can be no doubt that the doctrine once so frankly announced must be either tolerated or repudiated. There is no middle course. It is quite useless for the

¹ *Boston Evening Transcript*, August 7; see also *Boston Herald*, August 21.

² *Boston Evening Transcript*, August 18.

members of the Brown corporation to pretend to dwell upon any other issue until this stain is simply wiped away. And there should be no doubt, I repeat, that this is simply an issue of academic honor. Why I use these expressions is not hard to explain. We academic teachers, not only in our classrooms, but still more in our lectures to the general public, and in our answers to correspondents, have frequently to say things in the interests of truth which, on occasion, for all that we can know beforehand, may offend, which may run counter to some popular sentiment, which may discourage somebody from giving an intended legacy to our university. Such giving offense may be a duty. And all this happens simply because we have to think and to talk about serious matters—matters that men care for and often war over. Whatever those just limits of our liberty, of which I spoke before, may be, whatever doubt may exist as to what we have a right at any time to discuss, there can be no doubt that the principle, so clearly indicated in the letter to President Andrews is a principle that can be qualified by no adjective less plain than simply base.

Less thought-provoking, but a letter rousing much public interest was one written to the signers of the faculty protest by Richard Olney, a prominent Brown alumnus, who had recently been Secretary of State. The newspapers hinted that Olney might rebuke the faculty but when his letter was given to the press there proved to be no ground for this surmise. Olney had written:

Nothing could be better in matter or manner. It presents the grave issues raised by the unfortunate action of the corporation with singular lucidity and logical force and deals with them in a temper and spirit which are every way admirable. As you may know, I do not agree with what I understand to be Dr. Andrews's views respecting the free coinage of silver. I strongly deprecate the action of the corporation, indeed upon the precise ground that nothing could be better calculated to give currency and weight to those views. . . . The true objection however, to the course pursued towards Dr. Andrews by the corporation of Brown University is its implied inculcation of the doctrine that an institution of learning should above all things get riches and therefore should square its teachings and limit the utterances of its Faculty by the interests and sentiments of those who for the time being are the rich men of the community. The demoralizing and degrading character of this doctrine your letter fully exposes and thereby entitles you to the gratitude not only of American citizens generally, but of all well wishers to Brown University in particular.¹

¹ *Providence Bulletin*, September 1.

V

Not all members of the corporation were silent in the face of the criticism levelled against them. One of their number labelled the faculty letter as an invitation to "open revolt"; another described the signers as "juniors brought here during the last eight years by President Andrews." "If junior members of the faculty do not like the retirement of Dr. Andrews then the one thing I suggested would be in order—They must go." The redoubtable Walker undertook the defense of the committee in a long letter and an interview, both published by the *Boston Herald* in early August. With stout assertions of the belief of the corporation in freedom of speech, he argued that a Roman Catholic institution could not allow a professor to teach Calvinism, and that during the Civil War a Northern college could not have permitted a president to promulgate the right of secession.

The views of President Andrews, promulgated from Rhode Island and Pennsylvania to Colorado and California, are believed by the corporation to portend, if they take possession of the popular mind, more disastrous consequences to this continent than did the doctrine of the right of a state to secede from the Union.

This drew a terse comment from Judge Gaskell of Worcester. Quoting Walker's statement: "It is the unanimous opinion of the corporation of Brown University that the question upon which Dr. Andrews is at variance with it is far more vital to the well-being of the country than were the questions upon which the Civil War was fought; in fact, that this question is fundamental to the continued progress of Christian civilization," Judge Gaskell dryly remarked: "I am a member of the corporation and I for one do not assent to it and do not care to be made responsible for it."¹

The defense of the corporation position by Dr. Heman Weyland, though in a somewhat different tone, was scarcely more successful. In an open letter to the signers of the faculty memorial, he pointed out how kind had been the action of the corporation in granting to Dr. Andrews leave, how courteous its manner of conveying criticism to him, how chivalrous but how ill-judged and uninformed had been the action of the faculty in rising to the defense of one they

¹ *Boston Evening Transcript*, August 7.

thought wronged. That the letter of the committee was so unhappily framed as to make prominent that which was incidental and to omit the graver economic and moral aspects of the situation he admitted with regret. The amenities thus disposed of, he turned to what he considered the grave questions involved: Had an instructor, a minister, an editor, the president of a bank or a college the right to use his position to spread his views without being open to suggestion by those who had placed him in office? To Dr. Weyland that question answered itself as soon as asked. Did the occasion justify the act of the corporation? It did because of the vast injury to the country should free silver be adopted. Of this injury he gave a graphic picture, though most of the signers of the protest were opposed to free silver. There his defense for the time rested.¹

Once Dr. Jameson and his colleague, Professor Gardner, had successfully united a large proportion of the faculty in support of the open letter, they next turned to the problem of how best to enlist for their cause the influences outside Brown. Already Professor E. R. A. Seligman of Columbia had sent to them a letter of protest to be used as they saw fit, and he and Professor W. F. Willcox of Cornell had considered the possibility of presenting a formal memorial from the American Economics Association. After some correspondence this idea was abandoned and two memorials were circulated, one for general signatures, one to be signed by teachers of the social sciences. Neither of these was to be made public until it had been presented to the corporation at its meeting of September 1. The first, directed by Jameson and Gardner and ably assisted by professors in many institutions, was a brief statement of the opinion that the interests of free thought and free speech would be promoted by such action on the part of the corporation as might lead to the withdrawal of the resignation of President Andrews.

¹ *Providence Journal*, August 10. A second attempt at defense from Dr. Weyland's pen appeared in the *Independent*, August 26, and on August 23, in a letter to Dr. Jameson, after defending the corporation on the ground that it was within its legal right, he added: "I must be permitted to add that the course of those persons who are organizing the petition from the Alumni and who are securing an address from various College Presidents is fitted to defeat the end they have in view. It will be very difficult for members of the Corporation to receive with patience a communication from various College Presidents suggesting the method of managing the college. If these gentlemen have the right to be heard in this matter they have the right to be heard as to every matter that comes before the Corporation."

The second memorial, under the direction of Seligman, Tucker of Dartmouth, and George A. Mead, stated more strongly the creed of the signers but was less explicit in what was asked of the corporation.

We believe that no questions should enter except as to capacity, faithfulness, and general efficiency in the performance of appointed duty. To undertake inquiry as to the soundness of opinions expressed on any question, or set of questions, must inevitably limit freedom of expression, tend to destroy intellectual independence, and to diminish public respect for the conclusions of all investigators. . . . We therefore beg to express our earnest hope that your action on the proffered resignation of President Andrews will be such as to uphold and affirm, without possibility of misunderstanding, the principle of academic freedom.

A vigorous petition circulating among the alumni ended with a similar request:

We ask that by emphatic vote you shall announce to the public that enlightened toleration shall be the guide of our Alma Mater in the future as it has been the dearest tradition of her past.

The center of activity became Seal Harbor, Maine, where Dr. Jameson spent the month of August. Not far from him were the college presidents Eliot, Gilman, and Low, for a time joined by James A. Bryce, and among them were frequent conferences over tactics.¹ We possess only a few of Dr. Jameson's letters written during this period but from those written to him it is evident that the month was a busy one, for most of these indicate that the writers had received personal communications from Jameson. Some offer reasons for signing or not signing; others comment on the open letter or on the general situation. For the most part

¹ On August 13, President Eliot in a memorandum for Jameson wrote: "We all agree that it is important to get the signatures of influential businessmen who are Republicans," and later the same day a second note added: "I think the committee in charge of this memorial should urge upon the businessmen to whom they apply the consideration that gold standard men had better not appear in the light of persecutors or inquisitors. They will need to show themselves before the public as tolerant and confident in the reasonableness of their cause." Three days later: "Have you thought of getting Yale and Princeton signatures? It seems to me that Provost Harrison ought to have an opportunity of signing it. Perhaps Professor Brush, the Director of the Sheffield Scientific School, would sign it. He is a director of the N. Y. N. H. and H. R. R. I hope you are having good success with the bankers and capitalists at Bar Harbor."

college presidents and members of college faculties, when they could be reached, were eager to sign. Among the exceptions, however, were two important names: Woodrow Wilson and James B. Angell. The former wrote:

To invite him [Andrews] now to resume the presidency will be interpreted to mean that the Corporation has yielded to criticism, and not to mean that it has seen its error. It will be no retrieval of the mistake; and will create a very false relation between Dr. Andrews and those whom he serves. I do not think that we ought to ask Brown so to embarrass herself.

Nevertheless, on receipt of the second petition, that for teachers of the social sciences, he signed it with the explanation that though it asked the corporation to act in such a way as to affirm the principle of academic freedom, it did not specifically ask that President Andrews be retained. His signature was given only because he desired to endorse the expression of fear of the danger of interference with freedom of expression, not from any belief that the corporation could do anything to better the immediate situation at Brown. To ask them to retain Andrews was to ask them to do something that would be considered "the fruit, not of repentance, but merely of timidity."

President Angell's hesitation rested on quite different grounds. He replied to a request for his signature, which reached him by the way of Professor James Seth of Edinburgh, once a teacher at Brown, that he did not know what Andrews had really said or done.

So far as I have heard I have thought the trustees have made a grave mistake. Their letter certainly does not commend itself to me. I am a strong believer in *Lehrfreiheit*. So many of the Trustees are my old friends, for whose character and judgment I have great respect that I hesitate to enter upon a public condemnation, until I am sure I have before me all the facts in view of which they have acted.

Outside academic circles signatures were more frequently refused. Senator Hoar argued that while President Andrews had a right to express any opinions he wished, the corporation had an equal right to ask him to consider whether he was thereby injuring the university. The illustration which he used was a favorite one on his side of the controversy: suppose Robert Ingersoll had come

to his conclusions about Christianity while president of Harvard. His right to announce them was clear but it would have been the duty of Harvard to dismiss him. Senator Lodge declined to be involved in a question which lay outside his sphere. Francis C. Lowell regarded the action of the authorities of Brown as unwise and their letter as "even more stupid than insolent." Nevertheless he declined to sign a memorial, offering, as his reasons, his fear that his newspaper information might not be accurate, his uncertainty as to whether the withdrawal of the president's resignation was the remedy, and the fact that he had no connection with Brown and might be thought to be impertinent. George Gunton, publisher of the *Social Economist*, wrote: "I am as strong a believer in personal freedom as anyone, but I think the managers of investment have some rights as well as professors." Henry C. Lea of Philadelphia, student of witchcraft, believed that:

The issues involved in last year's election were so transcendent, imperiling the very foundations of our social and political organization, that in my view any man who lent his influence to that threatening combination of socialism and anarchism is unfit to be trusted with the training of American citizens.

Most of the lawyers and businessmen who were approached rested their refusal to sign the memorial on the ground that they did not know enough of the facts to warrant their expressing an opinion, but from one New York banker came a signature with his reasons:

I do this after reflection, believing that it is more important that our officers and Professors of American universities should feel untrammelled in their search after scientific truth and in the expression of what that search leads them to than that indiscreet utterances upon political questions should be repressed, but I am strongly of the opinion that no man should use his position in connection with an institution to give his expression of opinion more weight than his utterance as an individual would command—in other words, good taste, common sense, and a "just sense of accountability" should guide and control.

Among the bitterest critics of Dr. Andrews were some of the trustees of other universities. Professor Charles E. Bennett of Cornell University wrote that few members of the faculty who were within reach had refused to sign but that:

No trustee will sign; most *very* hostile. I was not prepared for the bitter epithets they apply to Andrews. "Damned fool," "enemy of society," were some of the choice epithets I met with in interviewing our Trustees. One of them declared he thought all these "few junior members" ought to be fired. Well, we are living in the Dark Ages yet in some respects.

At the University of Chicago, Princeton, and Yale those trustees interviewed also refused to support the memorial, one of them stigmatizing the views of Andrews as immoral and dishonest.

VI

In spite of these disappointments, the post office and the telegraph lines of Seal Harbor were busy during the final days of August, bringing last-minute signatures, while during early September there were many letters expressing regret that the writers had been unable to reply in time. When the corporation met on September 1, it had before it an accumulation of petitions and letters described by the newspapers as a foot thick. It also had for consideration the report of the ill-starred committee appointed in June and a long letter from President Andrews. The alumni petition, containing six hundred names, included those of men from every class since 1838; the general petition, which had been designed to accomplish its end by quality not quantity, bore seventy-seven names from twenty-six colleges and universities. Among them were those of eleven college presidents and of many of the foremost scholars of the country. To the memorial of the social scientists fifty names were affixed, from thirty-three institutions, including such well-known ones as Seligman, Taussig, Dewey, Willcox, Ely, Giddings, Ashley, Commons, and Clark.

Probably most members of the corporation when they gathered that morning knew what action they favored but the discussion continued until late afternoon, when it was announced to the waiting students gathered outside the hall that the corporation, never having wished to lose the services of Dr. Andrews, was asking him to withdraw his resignation. To his father Jameson wrote:

Well, the Corp. have behaved splendidly. I hope Andrews will stay, but anyhow, the fight is won, so far as the essential thing is concerned. I think the effect of the whole struggle on the univer-

sities and colleges of the land will be excellent, even if it does hurt this college temporarily.

It was true that the struggle for freedom of thought and speech was for that time and place won, but Brown had lost a president. Dr. Andrews consented to remain but one year longer, perhaps feeling that the rifts created within the corporation and the faculty would be more quickly healed if he were no longer a source of friction. That there were rifts, even though the first announcement of the action proclaimed it to be unanimous, was evident from an interview given to the *Journal* of September 9, in which Judge Durfee defended the action of the committee and reiterated the statement that it was essential that the funds of the university be increased.

The significance of the story lies not alone in the quick perception of the importance of the issue, in the prompt action and clear and courageous words of the faculty of Brown University, and in the willingness of the corporation to recognize and so far as possible to undo a mistake, but also in the equally quick response of other college faculties and in the interest of a large public. Day after day the newspapers of a wide area recorded each new happening, printed long communications, and expressed editorial opinions in a manner which demonstrated their belief that their readers were concerned with the outcome. It is true that the view of education taken by some was that it was a commercial matter to be guided in the same way as were other businesses but it is to the credit of the press that many papers stated the issue clearly and, without regard to their beliefs on monetary questions, took an unequivocal position in favor of academic freedom. Once the battle was over, E. D. Mead wrote of it:

It has been of a character so wholesome and inspiring, so indicative of the manliness and love of free inquiry of our scholars and the sound common sense of our people, that we are tempted to pronounce the whole episode something to be grateful for, rather than to be deprecated.¹

¹ "Academic Freedom in America," *New England Magazine*, September, 1897. For an account of the character of Dr. Andrews and of his work at Brown see an unsigned article, written by J. F. Jameson, in the *American Monthly Review of Reviews*, September, 1897.

THE NEW AUTHORITARIANISM¹

By GEORGE BOAS

The Johns Hopkins University

I am not one who is given to cries of alarm, who sees a crisis in every misdemeanor and the fabulous Dogs waiting at the end of the street for those who are going to them. And yet after thirty-five or forty years of teaching, I cannot but wonder whether the United States has learned much of anything from its great tradition of freedom and adventure, whether its statesmen are not almost eager to throw the traditions of their country into the sewer, and whether fear and hate have not taken the place of hope and charity in guiding the destinies of our culture.

Such despair may be only the fatigue of one who is no longer young and who lacks the strength to do much more fighting. We have survived for over a century and a half with our Constitution. We have developed a kind of civilization which every student of history knows to be unique. We are strong in material wealth, in inventiveness, and in national solidarity. The first is obvious and needs no elaboration by me. The second is paralleled by France and Great Britain. The third, while it sometimes expresses itself in a kind of childish chauvinism, nevertheless also expresses itself in a kind of friendliness and concern for others, in genuine brotherly love which is rare in the other countries which I happen to know.

A culture which has the traditions of solidarity and the ability to meet new problems with new solutions, and which also has wealth, really has little to fear and no excuse for hate. But one sees on all sides a creeping paralysis which has begun to infect our schools, our government, and the general public itself. The first symptom of that disease is the return of authoritarianism.

By authoritarianism I mean the doctrine that in all fields of life

¹ An adaptation of an address given on April 8, 1952, before The Johns Hopkins Washington Alumni Association; reprinted through the courtesy of the author and of *The Johns Hopkins Magazine*, Vol. III, No. 8, May, 1952.

there is a vested body of knowledge which is indisputable and which ought to be accepted as final. In religion this is revelation. In science it is the great body of natural laws. In government it is the constitution. In art it is usually the style of some master or group of masters represented by an academy. In common speech it is the dictionary. The authoritarian is the person who believes that all such rules of truth, beauty, and goodness are codified once and for all, and that there is a group of people who know what they are and whose knowledge ought to be asked for and followed when anyone is in doubt. Their opinion is never to be questioned. They form a sort of Supreme Court beyond which there is no appeal.

America is a country which turned away from that type of thinking in 1776. The moment when the colonists dared to challenge the authority of the British Parliament, they fomented revolution, un-British activities, and no pretty words spoken by their descendants in extenuation of their heresy can change that hard and presumably unpleasant fact. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, even Charles Carroll of Carrollton were rebels, who not only sought to overthrow their lawful government by force and violence but actually did so. Any one of them could have been hanged as a traitor, had he been caught, and the law would have been observed.

That most of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were also gentlemen, in the English sense of that word, is also true. They had every reason, one might think, to follow tradition and pray that God send them a rational and wise monarch in the place of the madman from Hanover, waiting patiently until God see fit to do so. But the fact is that they did not so wait or pray. I shall not expatiate on what they did do; you know as well as I.

In contrast to authoritarianism is what one might call the philosophy of individualism. In religion this comes down to freedom of conscience. A man reads the Bible and decides for himself what its message means; he does not go to the doctors to find out. If the Bible says, "Thou shalt not kill," he takes it seriously and determines for himself whether it is right to kill one's country's enemies, felons, Unitarians, monsters, and incurables. In science, this attitude is one of experimentation and personal investigation, seeing for oneself, checking up the conclusions of the past, Galileo

against Aristotle, Pasteur against Bastian, Lavoisier against the Phlogistonists.

In government it is reinterpretation of the laws by the courts, and in the last analysis the willingness to admit that law has to change as the times change. In art it is the independents against the academicians. And in common speech it is all of us against the dictionary. Individualism of this sort was the dominant philosophy of America until very recent times. It was never the only philosophy, for no set of ideas ever captures a civilization in its entirety.

II

What evidence have we that the United States is moving rapidly towards authoritarianism?

Recently I was quoted in an editorial in an upstate New York newspaper as saying something so stupid that I wondered what condition of body and mind I could have been in when I said it. We all, I suppose, say stupid things from time to time, and the mere fact that the words were stupid did not surprise me. The style was, however, so different from my usual mode of expression and the idea so contrary to what I believe that I was curious to learn what the source of the quotation might be.

By correspondence I found that the newspaper had bought the entire editorial from a service in Pennsylvania which presumably sells canned opinions to newspaper editors throughout the country. Now, no great harm was done to me by this editorial, though I have no way of knowing how many newspapers throughout the country bought it, but the fact that editors buy their opinions ready-made was somewhat startling. We know of course that writers on a variety of subjects sell their columns to syndicates which resell them to newspapers, but such articles contain at least a nucleus of news, news flavored to be sure by opinion.

Editorials, however, are supposed to be something different. They usually contain judgments of right and wrong, are critical in their purpose, represent (it is usually believed) the philosophy of the paper's staff. But here we find that a group of people settled in one state actually provides the judgments, the criticisms of right and wrong, the philosophy all ready-made for others. The editor has nothing to say in the matter at all. He buys his opinions all

expressed as one might buy a suit of clothes by mail. How simple a matter it would be for a few powerful people to form an editorial service of this sort and actually determine the judgments of right and wrong, of truth and falsity, of good and bad for the people as a whole.

But not only is opinion sold over the counter; so is news. All news is selected out of the total mass of events which occur from day to day. This is inevitable. No one has the time or the interest to read about everything which happens. The job of an editor is precisely to determine what news he thinks worth printing and what is not worth printing. Some papers specialize in some sorts of news—crime, scandal, personalities, education, foreign affairs, finance; others try to cover pretty nearly everything. This cannot be helped, even if there is any reason to change the system. One does not expect the five- and ten-cent stores to carry imported luxuries, nor the comics to discuss Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

But the standardization of news stories through syndicated columns and radio programs of commentators is something different; for if twenty or thirty papers carry the same column, the readers of twenty or thirty papers are all reading the same version of the same event. And if twenty million people get their impression of the news from the way it is presented by their favorite radio commentator, they too are bound to be influenced by what they hear, and they cannot hear both sides of the story. Certain writers and radio commentators become authoritative sources for what has happened in the world.

There are very few columnists and commentators who ever say, "This is the way I see it, but on the other hand, my opponents say" Their programs would begin to seem flat and stale if they did. For, unfortunately, people want to have the answers, not the questions, and, by force of listening to the answers only, they have forgotten, if they ever knew, precisely what the questions were.

The standardization of news and opinion would not be permitted if the people at large were not so hardened to it that they no longer objected. But they have got used to the idea that there are experts in opinions and in the selection of news, just as there are experts in chemistry, physics, and medicine.

If you happen to live in a city like Baltimore with a newspaper

which actually makes a determined effort to present several aspects of a question, while maintaining its own editorial opinion, you find the standardization of news in other parts of the country somewhat shocking. What is shocking about it is the placidity of the readers and listeners, or their indifference, for I do not pretend to know which it is.

Independence of judgment is an absolute essential if democratic government is to continue, for the democratic form of government is decision by discussion, not by the imposition of judgments from above. But discussion becomes a mockery if each side first listens to a radio commentator and then hands out his opinions and his selection of the facts as if he had discovered them for himself.

This habit of mind is precisely what accounts for the sudden shifts in opinion which occur in this country. Whether it is a question of presidential elections, graft in government, the drug menace, juvenile crime, or atheism in universities, the public has become accustomed to taking its facts and its opinions from men and women who seem to realize that the public memory is short and who have neither fear of self-contradiction nor responsibility to the truth.

This placidity is symbolized in popular speech in such phrases as "I don't mean to criticize but. . ." as if criticism were in itself something shameful, whereas it is one's duty in a democracy. One should want to criticize, to judge for oneself, and to make one's opinions known when it will serve some purpose to do so. Does anyone believe that his fellows are so perfect that they do not deserve criticism?

There are, to be sure, ways of criticizing which are base and disgusting. Attacks on irrelevant issues, on personal traits which have nothing to do with the question in hand, what logicians call *argumenta ad hominem*, would fall into that class. But on the other hand, if the people once become afraid of criticizing their representatives, they might just as well have an absolute monarch over them to tell them what to do and what not to do. And that would seem to be exactly what such people want. You will recall the voices a few years ago who would have preferred a Hitler or a Mussolini in the White House to *That Man*. Such people are afraid of their responsibilities as citizens of a free country and

are the same men who abdicated in Italy and Germany; for it must not be forgotten that both Mussolini and Hitler preserved the outer aspects of Legality. They are the same people who will not stick their necks out, see no sense in always fussing over principle, who just want to be let alone, who won't soil their hands in political waters.

III

We have been well prepared for all this intellectual humility by certain of our educators. The elective system of Mr. Eliot was devised for a society of free men who knew what they wanted to study and who could be tested for their aptitude in making their choice. Most universities at one time or another adopted some of its features. But it did not take long for some people to point out that this might lead to a hodgepodge of learning which would omit the greatest that had been thought and said.

If one selects, however, a group of books from the past which are supposed to contain all the knowledge which is worth having, one runs into the danger of believing that certain individuals in the past discovered final truth once and for all, whereas each of them was an innovator in his day and age and what he discovered was what was wrong. Neither Plato, nor Aristotle, nor Lucretius, nor St. Augustine, nor St. Thomas, nor St. Bonaventura, nor Galileo, nor Newton, nor Descartes, among those who figure on such lists, was a man who simply handed down the tradition of his fathers. Each saw new problems and changed tradition. The people who carried on the old tradition were people like Martianus Capella, Solinus, Prosper of Aquitania, the followers, the editors, the lexicographers, the encyclopedists, most of whom are known only to the more highly specialized historians.

The notion of a tightly knit curriculum, containing the supposedly best books, is a notion which will do well in a cloistered society where innovation is heresy, but it just will not work in a society living in time and conscious of actual problems. Its proponents are either ignorant of intellectual history or willfully desirous of producing a disciplined society with both orthodoxy and heterodoxy sharply defined.

But such people are gradually getting the upper hand in the United States, as may be seen by the growing attacks on recalcitrant individuals, on freedom of thought, and on what is wrongly called the confusion of the intellectuals. The recalcitrant individual is the artist, the scientist, the reformer, the philosopher, the religious leader. Abraham, Moses, and the Prophets were recalcitrant individuals, dissatisfied with things as they were. One looks in vain in the New Testament for any evidence that its principal figures were struggling to pass on the Old Law unchanged. The history of the arts, the sciences, and philosophy are all punctuated with individuals who saw problems which their predecessors did not see and who attempted to solve them in new ways.

The most striking feature of any list of the Best Books which I have ever examined is that each later author has been a rebel against the dominant traditions of his time. But of course such lists usually stop at a date well before our own times and we are not usually aware of precisely what harm to tradition was done by the men who figure on them. What progress has been made by human beings either in the fields of science, simple knowing, or in the field of the betterment of human conditions, in increasing human happiness, has been due not to fidelity to tradition but rather to the willingness of people to suffer martyrdom if need be for the sake of such progress.

If you were living in the days of early Christianity, you would have seen the same kind of confusion and intellectual anarchy as you hear about today. But what is called confusion is the outspokenness of recalcitrant individuals. When they are dead, then they are spoken of as heroes and prophets. But while they are alive, they are noncooperative, radical, and heretical.

Those of us who modestly attempt to contribute to the enlightenment of our fellows, who try our best to solve genuine problems, and not merely to repeat the solutions of the past, who are actually able to say "No" when "Yes" would be treachery to our conscience and to our intelligence, are now labelled traitors or, at the mildest, disturbers of the peace. But no man who is faithful to his job as a teacher or as one engaged in research has the right to say "Yes" on all occasions. We are engaged in the search for truth and in its dissemination.

Unfortunately the truth hurts. It hurts the feelings of everyone whose pet ideas it contradicts. Some of these ideas are sacred. Some have the prestige of tradition. Some are merely the ideas of men who hold positions of power in society. No one likes to have his ideas superseded, even when they are merely a matter of what to eat and what to wear. I have heard people become as emotional over the fact that undergraduates do not wear neckties as they would become over treason. People have been burned at the stake for maintaining that the universe was infinite in extent.

The result is that those of us who are less stubborn in our convictions engage in a kind of hypocrisy which is downright disgusting. One man testifies that he no longer subscribes to the *Nation* but buys it at a newsstand. Another apologizes to his butcher because he finds the price of beef too high for his purse, prefacing his comment with the remark, "I am not a Communist, but. . .". A third gives away his album of Paul Robeson records lest his friends think him subversive. A fourth takes an earlier streetcar to work lest he be overheard engaging in political discussions with his office-mates who might say something suspect. But such has always been the state of mind of people in times of panic. Overtly they conform, but within themselves they are as unconvinced as ever.

If one thinks about these things, the trends which they exemplify, the state of mind which prompts them, one cannot deny that the philosophy of authoritarianism is abroad in the land. The protestant, with a small *p*, is out of step. One must conform, agree, gosestep, chant hymns to Order, Discipline, Tradition.

It is not to be denied that there is a genuine need for authority in some regions of life. No one would be so silly as to maintain that a government could fulfill its functions if it did not have authority. It must have the power not merely to make decisions but also to execute them. In a democracy, it is undeniably the duty of everyone to obey the government once the decisions have been made. When one does not approve of a law, as most people in the East did not approve of the Volstead Act, the sensible thing to do is not to violate it but to work for its repeal. Though I personally think that loyalty oaths are stupid, being inefficacious in demanding that a person declare himself innocent of acts of which he has never been indicted, and in most of their forms an unwarranted trespass on a

person's private life, nevertheless if one were passed in my state and applied to all people, I should consider it inexcusable to refuse to take it. Granted that we need government, armies, and the law, they must possess a kind of authority which is unquestioned. They all change, to be sure, but there are orderly ways of changing them.

In science too there are certain acquisitions which we call facts or laws and which it would be nonsense to attempt to deny. No scientist would be bothered to verify for himself all of the laws of physics or chemistry or mathematics. To do so would be like a person's verifying tide-tables, or the phases of the moon as given on a calendar, or a telephone number.

We accept certain facts as established and we use them as if they were final. But at the same time we also maintain that they are on trial and can always be set aside when they turn out not to be well grounded. Thus the Ptolemaic system of astronomy could be accepted, if one wished, as we do accept it in common speech when we speak of the sun crossing the sky or rising and setting. But in spite of its prestige, when it turned out to be better—that is, simpler—to accept the Copernican system, scientists discarded the older arrangement as no longer satisfactory.

The progress of science is due above all to the scientists' willingness to consider all authorities as on trial. They serve until they are superannuated. Their proponents must submit to dethronement at any time regardless of their status as great authorities. What authorities say in science is not true because they are authorities, but they are authorities because what they say is true.

IV

There is thus admittedly a need for authority in government, in the military establishment, in science, and indeed in everyday life. But the kind of authoritarianism which is now becoming popular is simply excessive. If the sciences were complete and everything knowable were known, then all that scientists would find to busy themselves with would be tidying up the corners. If everything is known, as St. Thomas Aquinas seemed to think it was in the thirteenth century, then how silly it would be to try to discover something new.

But if you believe that there are still some truths to be discovered, it is just as silly to expect some authority to tell you the answers to what no one understands. Are there frontiers to knowledge or are there not? My point of view, like that of most university professors, is that there are.

There is no book or set of books to which we can turn for the answers to many questions about the mechanism of evolution, of heredity, of learning, of the relation of the individual to his environment. We know a great deal more than our fathers knew about diseases and their cure; but any pathologist would admit that there is more of which we are ignorant than there is of what we know. Again, take the case of psychology. What do we really know at present about the springs of behavior, of why the human race behaves as it does, of the influence of fear on action, of the difference between the behavior of individuals in isolation and in groups?

In fact, there are so many *terrae incognitae* to be explored that one is amazed that anyone should think he was more than a child standing in wonder at the sight of a flower or a star. Authority is helpless here, for there are no authorities in unexplored fields of learning. To say this is to state a tautology.

Not only are there enormous unexplored areas of science, there is always the challenge of novelty to plague us. It is all very well to say that human nature is always and everywhere the same. The truth is that in all essential matters it differs. We are all biological specimens to be sure, all being born and dying and eating and working. But every society that we know anything of controls and determines the way in which its members are born and die and eat and work.

Moreover, populations grow, new instruments of production and distribution are developed, members of foreign societies enter our society, the very physical environment changes through floods, erosion, the exhaustion of the soil, the creation of new land as in the Low Countries, and the old ways of meeting the situation will no longer work. Men must adjust to the changes, and innovation takes the place of tradition.

When one looks over the cultural history of the Occident, one comes to the conclusion that it is an uneasy balance between what

one might call resignation and rebellion on the part of individuals, between custom and improvisation on the part of social groups. Such cultural revolutions as the introduction of Christianity, the Reformation, the French Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, the introduction of gunpowder, the invention of printing, the discovery of the Western Hemisphere, the development of laboratory and experimental science, the elaboration of statistical techniques in thinking, all were responsible for the death of some things and for the birth of others.

There have been societies which have sought to prevent change. The Wall of China has become a symbol of such a society. No one could get out, no one could get in, and by keeping the people in a cloister it was hoped that a maximum of stability would be achieved. Contemporary Russia seems to be turning into such a cloistered society. Obviously if a man does not know that there are any alternatives to his way of living, he will be resigned.

But the Western World is not so cloistered. All attempts to prevent change have been frustrated. Such attempts have been made by academies in the arts and letters and even in the sciences, but they have come to nothing. Thus authority has given way in all fields except in certain religions, though even there growth has taken place.

The Constitution of the United States is a document which probably has lasted longer than any other similar document. And yet it too has had amendments and its articles have been submitted to interpretation by the courts and thus have been modified from the beginning of its history to the present. The New Authoritarians do not like this state of affairs. They overlook the hard fact that the document itself provides a means for amendment. The history of statute law in general illustrates the stupidity of thinking that a western society can survive without serious changes in its very heart. New things occur and the law has to be reinterpreted to fit them or new laws have to be written to control them. Who is so bold as to say that sheep-stealing should still be a capital offense or that the rule of primogeniture should still obtain or that popular government should give way to absolute monarchy or that women should lose the right to vote or that primitive communism should be reinstituted or, for that matter, that people should live in caves and hunt with bows and arrows?

This is, of course, a purely rhetorical question. But the New Authoritarians will not face it, and they act as if the answer were affirmative rather than negative. Universities are the places where new problems arise and where a serious attempt is made to answer them. In society in general, tradition takes care of things and we coast along by the inertia of custom. But to answer new questions by old solutions is like trying to do chemistry in terms of alchemy and medicine in terms of magic. Unless we assume that all problems have been both raised and answered, there must be some people who have society's permission to perceive and answer the new problems.

It is right here that the New Authoritarians step in and are at their most vicious. For they know well enough that if there actually are some new problems, there may be also new answers, and that will prove extremely upsetting to the settled modes of life. Hence professors are the pet targets of such people, for if you can silence the professors, you will have been pretty effective in keeping the rest of society in ignorance. The dictators learned this very early in their careers. In Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, in Stalinist Russia, political power took the place of free inquiry. Truth became the prerogative of the government. Authority took the place of reason, and intellectual discipline took the place of academic freedom.

There is no doubt that the authoritarians are right in seeing in the teaching body the greatest enemy to tradition as such. No professor worth his salt will teach as if he were inspired by supernatural powers and as if his say-so were final and incontrovertible. We are all committed to the doctrine that our truths are on trial and must constantly be re-submitted to examination. If they cannot meet the test, they must go. Nor is free inquiry a respecter of persons or of dogma. The people who practice it are human gadflies. But they are also the nerve of civilization, and the moment that nerve is cut, civilization perishes.

LIBERTY AND THE PURSUIT OF TRUTH

By JOSEPH E. BAKER

State University of Iowa

Many liberal professors have done a great deal to undermine the foundations of academic liberty; and a false liberalism obscures the issues. We might hope that some recent lightning may have helped to clear the air. In 1951 there was published by a Chicago company (Regnery) *God and Man at Yale, the Superstitions of "Academic Freedom,"* by William F. Buckley, Jr. A sound comment on this book appeared in a *Life* editorial on October 29, 1951. This recognized that the issues raised in terms of one college certainly concerned all the universities in America:

It appears that academic freedom is the highest value Yale, even Christian Yale, knows. Academic freedom is akin to freedom of conscience—a cornerstone of Protestantism. The answer to secularism is much harder for a Protestant university than for Buckley. The search for a Protestant answer has nevertheless been active and fruitful.

Mr. Buckley's ideal professor would have no freedom to teach the truth as he saw it if he found himself in disagreement with the decisions of his superiors in matters of "faith and morals" and of economics. Such a teacher must teach what he is told to teach. And he is not told by his "customer" what ideas to sell. (His customer is the student.) He is to be told by his boss, or by "the administration," according to Mr. Buckley's tacit assumption and explicit statements:

It is plain that the president of a university cannot transmit to the students his own values directly. . . . He must therefore utilize intermediaries, men of similar convictions, to do the job. This academic freedom forbids. It is therefore an appalling yet indisputable fact that because of the restraints of "Academic Freedom," the president of Yale has far less influence on the student body than

have scores of influential professors who are allowed—in fact encouraged—to teach just as they will, to traffic, within loose limits, in whatever values they choose. It is curious that the Corporation spends so much time and effort in selecting a president (p. 172).

This last sentence is a reminder that Buckley does not mean to imply that a college president should be free. Like a bishop, he owes obedience to those who are in authority above him, and so on throughout the various ranks of the hierarchy. The place of the Pope in this scheme is filled by the Yale alumni. In the last chapter of this challenging book the author, in summarizing his own argument, asserts, "Freedom is in no way violated by an educational overseer's insistence that the teacher he employs hold a given set of values" (p. 194). And he concludes, without flinching, "I shall not say, then, what specific professors should be discharged, but I will say some ought to be discharged. I shall not indicate what I consider to be the dividing line that separates the collectivist from the individualist, but I will say that such a dividing line ought, thoughtfully and flexibly, to be drawn. I will not suggest the manner in which the alumni ought to be consulted and polled on this issue, but I will say that they ought to be, and soon. . . ." (p. 197). But the statement "I shall not indicate" misrepresents the nature of the book, in which he has clearly indicated that he would fire, as collectivists, all New Dealers; all professors who recommend economics texts by Samuelson, Tarshis, Morgan, Bowman, and Bach; all convinced believers in inheritance tax or graduated income tax; all who speak of "unfair distribution of income" or say "these are changing times."

These citations should make it clear that while Mr. Buckley's position is not Protestant, it is not Catholic either. The *Life* editorial is misleading when it says, in speaking of Buckley, "he is a devout but unusually aggressive Catholic." His insistence that economics be kept separate from political science and ethics is not Catholic. Indeed, the Catholic Church has made a great contribution to modern humanitarian thought in its revival of aggressive Aristotelian teaching to the effect that all social studies must ultimately be subsumed under ethics.

But there is another way in which this book clashes with the basic assumptions of Catholicism, in spite of its emphasis on hier-

archy and authority. In Catholic thought, the ultimate Authority is not any man or group of men, but the Truth itself. To *do good* is an ultimate aim, towards which end obedience is just a necessary means. Scorn for those who would "do good" is not Catholic. And it is abject idolatry to take as one's ultimate criterion the interests and desires of any group of men, even if it be a group as worthy as the Yale alumni. Speaking as a Catholic, one could not express approval of Congregationalist teaching such as this book would logically recommend for Yale; and a devout Catholic could not say, "If the alumni wish secular and collectivist influences to prevail at Yale, that is their privilege." If "secular and collectivist" ideas are false and vicious, why should the alumni have the privilege of inculcating them? Should the wealthy alumni of a Nazi university be free to indoctrinate students with antisemitism? Where is the author's boasted faith in God's revelation? Mr. Buckley has placed himself on the side of all the backsliding governments of ancient Palestine in their conflicts with all the true prophets. He resembles the high priest of Israel who denounced Amos on similar snobbish grounds, saying,

O thou seer, go, flee thee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread, and prophesy there: but prophesy not again any more at Bethel: for it is the king's chapel, and it is the king's court.

For the real Catholic—or Protestant, or Jew—any house of true worship is God's; its teaching is not to be determined by the alumni. Even the irreligious rationalist stands with the Biblical tradition in this faith, though he gives it a different formulation, and must be equally shocked when a representative of "religion" says,

O thou professor, go, flee thee away into a state university, and there earn your bread and say there, "These are changing times"—but prophesy not again any more at Yale: for it is a rich man's university, and it is a rich man's classroom.

The Catholic would think that it is a rich man's privilege—or a king's privilege—to build a church, and to endow its ministrants—but not to use it to teach falsehood. The Catholic Church, like Plato's Republic, has often been compared to the authoritarian

State; but we must always remember this profound difference: the authoritarian State (or Class) does not recognize any transcendent standard of truth or justice which all its human officials must serve. Plato's philosopher-kings and the great Councils of the Church did not ask, as Buckley would have the alumni of any university ask, "What will it profit us if we gain new ideas and lose our own wealth?"

And that is why *God and Man at Yale* must really embarrass many self-styled "liberals." Its basic assumptions are not religious; they are not absolutist at all; they are relativist. Pragmatists, positivists, semanticists, a "liberal" Supreme Court judge like Holmes, dozens of literary men—these have repeatedly told us that in the realm of values there is no absolute truth. Bertrand Russell, one of the martyrs respected by believers in academic freedom, says "science cannot decide questions of value. . .and what science cannot discover, mankind cannot know." The average skeptical professor gives still less philosophic consideration to such problems. As to what is right or wrong, "What is truth?" asks many a jesting teacher, and will not stay for an answer. There are departments in the social sciences, psychology, and philosophy, which would not appoint a professor who seriously proposed that we stay for such an answer. In the name of tolerance, the privilege of "academic freedom" has been denied to scholars and critics who are not *orthodox* liberals. Mr. Buckley makes that point with devastating justice, whether or not he is right about Yale, whether or not he would substitute something worse. Have we reached the tragic position of German thought, where liberal relativism prepared the ground for Fascist relativism, asserting that there is no such thing as real truth or justice, but merely the desires of individuals and groups? Such "liberals" are stymied; they cannot make the most effective reply to Mr. Buckley and the Fascists, which would be to assert, with all firmness and humility, that it is the business of a professor to teach the truth, as he sees it, even when he is talking not about facts but about values.

If we can know nothing about values, then the Fascist has as much right as anyone to indoctrinate students with whatever prejudices he wishes. If all we can know consists in facts about natural forces, the liberal has no firm ground to stand on. Few liber-

als are really such skeptics, in their profoundest convictions, but it is fashionable for them to talk as if they were, and thus knock the props out from under their own rational position. Buckley catches them in this inconsistency, shows that they do not, at Yale, believe in *complete* freedom to teach anything whatever if it be too antisocial. From this he concludes that "academic freedom" is a fraud and a hoax. He urges that it be eliminated. And why not? Let us see if we can say why not.

II

Again, serious intellectual circles are torn between the followers of Protagoras and the followers of Socrates. It is a perennial conflict, on issues vital to Western civilization itself. But there is no clear agreement as to whether Protagoras (or his modern counterpart) should be called "radical" or "reactionary," a defender of "democracy" or of "tribal thinking." He has an almost naïve faith in the effectiveness of education, especially of education in values, aiming to "adjust" the student to the *mores* of his group. He assumes that what professors say in lectures will determine what the next generation will think. Socrates himself has some doubts. He maintains, tentatively, that "good citizenship" cannot be taught, and that the sons of a great citizen like Pericles are no better than anyone else. But it finally becomes clear that Socrates' "doubts" in matters of right and wrong, justice and injustice, are similar to the "doubts" of a scientist. He believes (unlike the relativist Protagoras) that there is real knowledge to be obtained, and that it can be discovered by exerting the human mind. In that sense a student can learn, but he cannot be "taught," what virtue is; that is, he can think ethical problems out for himself (aided by Socratic questioning) but he cannot be given genuine knowledge by indoctrination from on high, not even from the platform of the most learned and interesting lecturer.

But this does not bother Protagoras—or his modern counterpart. He did not claim that we can know what is good or bad. He is interested in the inculcation of the values of a group. Another group—say the Yale alumni, or the Japanese army, or the "hundred per cent Americans," or the pre-Civil-War slaveholders

—might have a different set of values. Protagoras is confident that "The fundamental obligation of education in any society is to transmit to coming generations that which the society thinks is good." (This quotation is actually from an article by an American "educator," that is, an administrator, who wrote also that we need a "frank, direct, and powerful program of indoctrination in the schools.") Protagoras has no need of academic freedom. He was irritated at being expected to stay for a discussion.

The relativism of Protagoras has been popularly taken for liberal tolerance; the assurance of Socrates that he can know the truth has often been called arrogant. But there is in the Socratic (or Platonic) position a basic humility, similar to that of the scientist, humility in the belief that a man ought to try to learn the truth. It is hard to see how Protagoras, or the Yale alumni, or any state or nation, following the method of Protagoras, could ever make any progress. A group bent on inculcating its own existing values may do just that, generation after generation; but how can it advance? Surely the Yale alumni have realized this for a long time, and have shown little inclination to follow Protagoras. But other, less civilized social forces do threaten today to adjust us to group *mores*. In formulating a sound defense of academic freedom we must cut loose entirely from some of the liberal-sounding relativism so often associated with it. It is no reply at all to ask, jesting, "Who is to say what is the truth?" Our defense must be more sober, and more modest. We must admit, what we really believe, that some statements are more true than others in the realm of values. We must admit that it is the duty of the professor to exercise his mind constantly to learn more about true values, to improve his sense of justice, his sense of beauty, his sense of spirituality. We are not merely speaking of facts and information and skills, but of evaluations also, when we say of a genuine professor that "gladly would he learn," as well as "gladly teach."

But who is to teach the teacher? The administrator, acting as errand-boy for the alumni? or acting as coordinator for the government? Of course not. No one is to teach the teacher. He must function like the ideal Socratic student: he must learn for himself. This is why a first rate faculty must have academic freedom: not because it would be an old-fashioned superstition to say that there

are truths to be learned; but because such truths can be learned only by this method.

Another way of approaching this problem is to ask if professors are professional men or servants—highly skilled intellectual servants like the Greek philosophers bought as slaves by wealthy Romans. The latter, Buckley implies. But in the university traditions of Western Europe, and in Germany itself when German universities were great, the professor was considered as much a member of a “liberal” (*i. e.*, free) profession as a physician. His public did not tell him what decisions to make. A hospital administrator selects a physician, yes, but it leaves to him the decision as to what to prescribe in the light of medical knowledge. A wise university administrator appoints a professor, but leaves to him the decision as to what is the best insight available, in economics, or religion, or literary criticism, or political science. A physician might be dismissed because he violated the ethics of his profession, or because other physicians considered him incompetent. A professor might be dismissed for showing open contempt for scholarly method. But where there is reasonable possibility of disagreement (*i. e.*, in controversial matters), freedom to teach his own conclusions must be left to the professor, if he is to be thought of as a professional man competent to seek the truth. It is precisely as to controversial matters that the opponents of academic freedom, all over the world, would treat the professor as a skilled servant, versed in the “techniques of teaching” and utterly incompetent to make any intellectual advances in his own field. In Mr. Buckley’s view, one college president is capable of telling scholars in many departments what they ought to say, but they cannot know from their own study in any one field what ought to be said. Indeed, Buckley makes it clear that a businessman giving part of a busy life to service on the Yale Corporation should have more to say about what is taught in the department of Religion than the profoundest scholar in that department. And Buckley’s view is important because it is typical of a trend that has already come to dominate many universities in the world, a trend that may grow, perhaps unconsciously, in America. Many educators have already accepted almost all the basic assumptions of Protagoras, and many scholars who claim academic freedom fail to understand what it implies.

III

It implies, among other things, that the professor should be trained, professionally, for his job. Genuinely educated, a body of scholars—"men thinking"—should be more competent than any other group to come nearer and nearer to the truth in their own field. I will not say that they will ever discover a formula that expresses Absolute Truth, for I think that knowledge and taste in any field are infinitely improvable. But some doctrines, even in the realm of values, can be rationally rejected as erroneous or as inappropriate, and "some tastes deserve the cudgel." Obviously, to do this kind of thinking, the scholar must know more than the special facts of a special field. He must know other branches of human activity well enough to relate his own investigations to broader concepts. For this kind of professional work, the kind that demands and justifies academic freedom, many of our graduate programs of training for the Ph.D. are far too narrow. To leave the political scientist ignorant of philosophy or the literary man ignorant of political history is as bad as to leave the M.D. ignorant of anatomy. But it is not merely a question of knowing more facts. Before evaluating, a scholar should apply his mind to evaluative studies. I do not mean primarily ethical and esthetic theory. I mean that as part of his professional training he should study in courses where values are a primary concern. And obviously the artist should not specialize exclusively in esthetic values or the religious scholar shut his eyes to beauty. All of this may sound so obvious that any department would be expected to take it for granted. Anyone who thinks so has a shock in store for him. He should analyze the requirements often laid down for the Ph.D. degree, and the criteria sometimes taken for granted in estimating professorial achievement! Such over-specialized scholars should not be denied academic freedom. For they will assuredly inculcate values, whether competently or incompetently. Only by having freedom available can they ever develop the ability to exercise it more competently. The most poorly trained staff of physicians is more likely to make recommendations that take into account new medical views than either the hospital administration or the former patients. This assumes, of course, that there is truth

for them to learn and teach, an assumption not made by Protagoras, or by Mr. Buckley and many of his liberal opponents.

Another implication of academic freedom is that those who claim it should grant it. Mr. Buckley does make this point, but like German fascists pointing out lack of liberty in the British Empire, he concludes that less is desirable, whereas we must recommend more. Like the rest of those who would suppress intellectual freedom in America today, he looks upon himself as a defender of American freedom. If his economics department is as narrow as he says it is, the cure is to add other professors who will advocate, persuasively, quite different points of view. His substitution of a prejudiced servile department for a prejudiced free department would not increase freedom of thought or integrity; it would certainly diminish competence. There is a great difference between a professor saying something because he has been told that this is the way to please the wealthy alumni, and a professor saying something because it is the truth as he sees it. And I doubt that students go to the department of economics at Yale to find out what will please the preceding generation of graduates. They go to an economics professor as they go to a doctor or lawyer or engineer, wanting honest, expert opinion, even while recognizing that sometimes "the doctors disagree." Buckley's conclusion, that the doctors ought to achieve agreement by accepting authoritarian domination from outside and above, sacrificing their own judgment of the truth, is exactly the opposite of mine, which is that the doctors ought to achieve more disagreement by respecting more independent judgment. The kind of unity Buckley's department would exemplify has been praised by Stalin as "monolithic." It is Hitler's "Gleichschaltung."

In this argument I am not concerned mainly with the morality, the fairness, of granting to others a freedom one claims for oneself. I am speaking of efficiency. Academic freedom is *technically* the most effective device for the discovery of truth. We learn much from those we disagree with. For example, I am convinced that relativism is a false philosophy; but I have learned much of what I know from relativists and indeed from their very relativism itself. It horrifies me to think what a university would be like which excluded from its staff all such false philosophers. How can

a really liberal education, or an effective professional training, be offered by a department which insists that all its members be pragmatists? or Thomists? or Keynesians? or positivists? or neo-humanists? or New Critics? Such departments cannot perform what the Socratic method implies, developing the student's mind by confronting it with genuine issues and alternatives. If a professor insists that his own department remain monolithic, treating alternative theorists as charlatans who ought not be hired to teach, then he does not really value academic freedom even when he says he claims it for himself. So far Buckley is right.

Academic freedom is not merely a privilege for the one who speaks freely; it is not merely a guarantee of liberal education for the student; it is also a means by which scholars learn from each other. The totalitarian handling of the Lysenko affair in Russia, parallel as it is to the procedure Buckley recommends for Yale, not only penalized the dissident biologists, and the students who wished to learn biology; it also penalized the biologists who were in orthodox agreement with the party line. The value of academic freedom is not only that one is free to teach the truth as one sees it; but also that one is free to learn from those with whom one disagrees. Real scholars want to hear theories that they may know to be demonstrably false, and to weigh, seriously, emotional appeals they are sure to reject. How else can thinking be advanced? Must we say with the fascists, as summarized by Kolnai, "Men can only approach supreme values through the mediation of their superiors"? That is one of the fallacies that the human mind, by experience and reasoning, has been able to refute. The glamorous defense of chattel slavery is another. *God and Man at Yale* utters other such heresies that have already been disposed of by rational Western culture; but it is perhaps just as well to have these issues raised again. We may be reminded that our real convictions should not be falsified in our ways of defending them.

To summarize: Academic freedom cannot be defended by the relativist argument that no man's evaluation is really better than any other man's. That opens the way for Mr. Buckley and all the totalitarians. The real defense of academic freedom for the professor is precisely that one man's evaluation is better than another's if that man is nearer to the truth; and that the expert, in any field,

while he may often be mistaken, is *likely* to be nearer the truth than anyone else. Where the experts disagree, *i. e.*, in controversial matters, academic freedom is an absolute essential if we are to have sufficient disagreement to keep the public from thinking the truth lies in some easy dogma. It is here that monolithic departments themselves fail to maintain academic freedom. Professors who smile upon the development of such exclusive "schools" and cliques have themselves chiefly to blame if their concern for academic freedom is misunderstood. When the experts *agree*, then we have the most dangerous situation and the greatest need for academic freedom; for there must be openings whereby a hearing can be given to those mavericks who challenge a whole profession—a Galileo, a Darwin, an Irving Babbitt, a Charles Beard, a Socrates. Above all, we must maintain the conviction that a professor ought to teach only what he thinks to be true. This, for the professor, is equivalent to the Oath of Hippocrates for the physician. It is the central ethical core without which the profession would cease to be a profession. Almost any honest professor would of course reject Buckley's proposal that he separate his functions: teaching, as employee of the Yale alumni, what he has found false in his other function as independent scholar. But we must recognize that the professor puts himself and all of us in an almost equally bad position if he starts with the basic assumption that there is no truth (except in matters of fact) and that nothing is either good or bad; or if he argues that all metaphysical and ethical concepts are so much semantic error. That way fascism lies.

"LIFE-ADJUSTMENT" EDUCATION: A CRITIQUE

By ARTHUR E. BESTOR, JR.

University of Illinois

Upon public education the security and well-being of our Republic rest. American public schools have the responsibility of raising up a nation of men and women highly literate, accurately informed, and rigorously trained in the processes of rational and critical thought. If the schools fail in this, then we may expect to see the collapse or defeat of democratic self-government through the sheer inability of its electorate to grapple intelligently with the complex problems in science, economics, politics, and international relations that constantly come up for public decision.

In addition to this, the American public schools, working in close harmony with the colleges, universities, and professional schools, have the responsibility of training scientists, scholars, engineers, physicians, and other professional men equal in competence to the best which any educational system is capable of producing. As far as the secondary school is concerned, this specialized task differs little, if at all, from its more general responsibility, for the object in both instances is to furnish young men and women with accurate knowledge and with disciplined command of fundamental ways of thinking. If the public schools shirk their task of providing intellectual training for every part of our citizenry, they endanger the freedom and safety of our whole society. If a nation suffers the loss of intellectual power—whether general or specialized—the loss of its industrial prosperity and its military security cannot be far off.

Less tangible, but no less real and significant, are the cultural values of a nation, which can likewise be safeguarded only through intellectual training in its schools. With a decline of respect for cultural and intellectual values in and for themselves comes a decline of faith on the part of a people in its own higher purposes, an

undermining of genuine loyalty, a destruction of freedom of thought and of speech, and finally a loss of that self-respect which, to a man or a nation, is the ultimate source of courage and hope and virtue and will.

Viewed under all these aspects, the performance of an educational system must finally be judged by its effectiveness in providing intellectual training. Through intellectual training men are most effectively prepared for citizenship, for the vocations and professions of practical life, for the profitable employment of their leisure time, for the advancement of knowledge and of civilization, and for the realization of their own high personal destiny as rational beings. This is the traditional conception of liberal education. This is the central conviction, today as always, of scholars, scientists, members of the learned professions, and educated men, whatever their specialized fields of activity. This is also, I believe, the only conception of education that really makes sense to the general public when they seriously consider what the schools are for.

II

Over against this conception may be set one of the most influential statements of the educational philosophy that has come to dominate the American public schools:

Youth have specific needs they recognize; society makes certain requirements of all youth; together these form a pattern of common educational needs, which may be expressed as follows:

1. All youth need to develop salable skills.
2. All youth need to develop and maintain good health and physical fitness.
3. All youth need to understand the rights and duties of the citizen of a democratic society.
4. All youth need to understand the significance of the family for the individual and society.
5. All youth need to know how to purchase and use goods and services intelligently.
6. All youth need to understand the influence of science on human life.
7. All youth need an appreciation of literature, art, music, and nature.

8. All youth need to be able to use their leisure time well and to budget it wisely.
9. All youth need to develop respect for other persons.
10. All youth need to grow in their ability to think rationally.

It Is the Job of the School to Meet the Common and the Specific Individual Needs of Youth.¹

No one can take serious exception to these ten items in themselves. Young men and women do have these needs. At first glance, indeed, the passage may appear to bear some resemblance to what was said in the opening paragraphs of this paper. Upon second reading, however, questions begin to come thick and fast. Why should not students understand science itself, rather than merely "the influence of science on human life"? What is meant by the "appreciation" of nature? Why is nothing said about understanding the past in order to grasp the problems of the present? Why is it not considered important that young men and women should be able to express themselves clearly and accurately in their mother tongue? Why have they no need to understand the world outside the boundaries of their own country through the study of geography or comparative government or international relations or foreign languages? Why is there not even an indirect reference to arithmetic or any other form of quantitative thinking? Little by little the shortcomings and disproportions of this statement, or rather of the philosophy behind it, become apparent.

In the first place, the vague inclusiveness of the statement conceals a fundamental ambiguity of thought. An attempt is being made to define education exclusively in terms of the needs of youth, without reference to the capabilities of the school. The attempt ends in a *reductio ad absurdum*, embodied in the last sentence, which is fantastically untrue. It is *not* the job of the school to meet the common and the specific individual needs of youth. If it were, then the school should undertake to meet needs even more basic than any mentioned in the list: All youth need food, clothing, and shelter. The opening sentence of the statement, it is true, contains a qualifying word, for it speaks of common educa-

¹ National Association of Secondary-School Principals, *Planning for American Youth: An Educational Program for Youth of Secondary-School Age* (Washington, 1944), p. 10. This widely circulated pamphlet is a summary of *Education for All American Youth*, published by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association.

tional needs. But this does not remove the fallacy, for no criterion is offered by which to distinguish educational needs from other needs. Such a distinction cannot be made on a logical basis without introducing into the argument some definition of education more precise and specific than that it is a means of satisfying needs. The distinction between educational needs and other needs simply cannot be deduced from a proposition about needs in general. To try to do so is to argue in a circle.

The nature of the school—what it is designed to do, and what it is capable of doing—provides the only possible starting-point for logical thinking about education. The school is a particular kind of institution, and, like every institution, it has a definite field of competence and definite limitations. Only by considering what these are can we differentiate between educational needs and other needs, or (to put it in positive terms) between educational functions or services and other services in society. Furthermore, only by considering the competence and the limitations of the school can we determine the relative importance of different educational functions.

The school is one, but only one, of the agencies of society ministering to the needs of young men and women. The family, the church, the medical profession, the government, the agencies of social welfare, the industrial corporation, and the private businessman all have something to do with meeting the needs of citizens, young and old. The fact that other agencies may not be doing their jobs as well as, or in the manner that, one would like is no reason for the school to neglect its own tasks, too, in an attempt to remedy the deficiency.

The idea that the school must undertake to meet every need that some other agency is failing to meet, regardless of the suitability of the schoolroom to the task, is a preposterous delusion that in the end can wreck the educational system without contributing appreciably to the salvation of society. Much of the cant about education for "home and family living" is a disguised way of saying that the school must take responsibility for things that the family today is supposedly failing to do. If family life is in a parlous state, that is a national calamity. But it does not mean that we can or should reproduce its intimacies in the schoolroom. Even if

it were true, for example, that parents are not giving adequate sex instruction to their children (and I suspect that they are giving it more fully, and explicitly than in any earlier period), does anyone seriously expect an embarrassed school teacher to explain the physiology of human reproduction to boys and girls in public, and to use franker and more explicit terms than their parents are willing to employ in private?

There are many needs of youth which the school has no ability to meet, and has no business trying to meet. There are additional needs which it can assist other agencies in meeting, but for which primary responsibility lies elsewhere. Finally, there are needs which the school alone can meet comprehensively and satisfactorily. Here lies the primary responsibility of the school, the responsibility it cannot shirk without disaster, the responsibility it may not sacrifice to any other aim however worthy. And this is nothing more nor less than the responsibility for intellectual training, in every field of activity where intellectual effort is an important component, and for every citizen who is capable of applying, and willing to apply, intellectual means to the solution of the problems that confront him.

As a matter of fact, intellectual training—that is to say, genuine education—can contribute importantly to the satisfaction of many of the needs of young men and women. In general, the most powerful means of solving any problem is to apply to it accurate knowledge and systematic processes of thinking. Nevertheless, the importance of the intellectual component in achieving a satisfaction of needs does vary considerably with the type of need. And this fact—rather than the urgency of the need itself—determines the degree of importance which the satisfaction of that need ought to assume in the program of a school. Certain needs, though important in themselves, deserve little attention in the making of an educational curriculum, simply because the school can contribute so little of importance to their satisfaction. On the other hand, certain needs cannot be satisfied at all except through an extensive and rigorous application of intellectual means. The school alone can provide the systematic intellectual training required. In this realm lies the peculiar and overriding responsibility of the school.

Now, universal public education can only be defended on the assumption—a correct assumption, I believe—that needs which require satisfaction by intellectual means are common to all men. To say that the masses of men do not have needs that require satisfaction by intellectual means is merely another way of saying that they do not need education. I deny that this is true. But if professional educators believe that most men have no need for intellectual training, then they should honestly say so and work for the abolition of compulsory school laws. It is sheer dishonesty to advocate schooling for all and then to turn about and argue that men have no need for the very thing which the school is designed to furnish.

Such dishonesty does characterize the propaganda of many professional educators today. Their vague language is often a cloak under which they seek to conceal the strongly anti-intellectualist bias of their proposals. The omission of all reference to intellectual means in their pompous formulations of educational ends is a deliberate omission. Many of the points in the statement quoted at the beginning of this paper *could* imply disciplined intellectual training. "All youth need to understand the rights and duties of the citizen of a democratic society" *could* mean "All youth need sound training in history, political science, economics, and the other kinds of disciplined thinking that will enable them to understand the rights and duties of the citizen of a democratic society." The point, however, is that the statement does not say this and does not promise this. And the omission must be considered deliberate, because it would have been so easy to specify means and because it is the peculiar responsibility of the educator to do so.

After all, anyone can formulate a magniloquent statement of purposes. The difference between the promises of a quack and the promises of a responsible professional man is that the latter binds himself to employ means that are recognized, that are capable of being rationally explained, and that are open to examination by all who will qualify themselves to understand them. But a program of any kind that deliberately neglects to specify the means of its accomplishment is a program to beware of, for it may prove utterly fraudulent. Under cover of its high pretensions, irresponsible men are empowered to do exactly as they please. This is pre-

cisely what has happened in American secondary education. High-sounding objectives like the quoted ones have been offered as preambles to educational proposals of the utmost vagueness, proposals that in reality commit the sponsors to nothing. By speaking with conscious ambiguity, professional educators have freed themselves from the restraining influence of scholarship and science, and have opened the schools to a most vicious and pervasive anti-intellectualism.

In place of a clear-cut program of intellectual training in the schools, a multitude of vague, inchoate plans for "real-life" or "life-adjustment" education have been introduced. The programs that go by the latter name are relatively new, but the anti-intellectual trend among professional educators has been gathering momentum for a generation. As far back as 1936 an educator thoroughly sympathetic with the new ideas undertook to survey 170 school systems in which the curriculum was undergoing revision. He received replies from two-thirds of these. On the point in question the exact words of his report are most illuminating: "No more than three fourths of the total number of faculty groups on any school level typically incline toward the view that the major emphasis of the curriculum should be on the social education of the child rather than on his mental development."¹ In straightforward English, this sentence asserts that only about one-fourth of the educators associated with experimental curricula continue to put intellectual training first among the purposes of the school, while approximately three-fourths are ready to subordinate it to something else.

III

Let us examine that "something else." At the present moment the most popular substitute for intellectual training is "life-adjustment" education. It is not the only program which professional educators are promoting—it occupies only one of the three rings in their circus—but it is widespread and typical enough to

¹ Harold C. Hand, "Analysis of the Present Status in Curriculum Thinking" in Joint Committee on Curriculum, *The Changing Curriculum* (New York, 1937), pp. 6-7.

make it worthy of study as an example of what happens to the schools when their leaders repudiate intellectual ends.

"Life-adjustment" education was launched, as a national program, as the result of the following resolution adopted at a conference of educators in 1945:

It is the belief of this conference that, with the aid of this report in final form, the vocational school of a community will be able better to prepare 20 percent of the youth of secondary-school age for entrance upon desirable skilled occupations; and that the high school will continue to prepare another 20 percent for entrance to college. We do not believe that the remaining 60 percent of our youth of secondary school age will receive the life-adjustment training they need and to which they are entitled as American citizens—unless and until the administrators of public education with the assistance of the vocational education leaders formulate a similar program for this group.¹

Some of the implications of this statement were made clearer when the original resolution was revised and rephrased and made to include the following sentences:

In the United States the people have adopted the ideal of secondary education for all youth. As this ideal is approached, the high school is called upon to serve an increasing number of youth for whom college preparation or training for skilled occupations is neither feasible nor appropriate.²

Though other educators were about to insist that "at least 49 percent of our population has the mental ability to complete 14 years of schooling" and "at least 32 percent. . . the mental ability to complete an advanced liberal or specialized professional education,"³ the proponents of "life-adjustment" education were able to find powerful support for their program, based though it was on the explicit assertion that 60 per cent of the American people are unfit for intellectual pursuits or even for "desirable skilled occupations." Their own words admit of no other meaning than that the

¹ *Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth* (U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1951, No. 22; Washington, 1951), p. 16, n. 2. This statement, prepared by Dr. Charles A. Prosser, "has now become an historic resolution," according to the compilers of this Bulletin.

² *Ibid.*, p. 18, note 2.

³ President's Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy* (1947-48), as excerpted in Gail Kennedy, ed., *Education for Democracy* (Boston, 1952), p. 20.

schools must "adjust" some three-fifths of our children to the bitter fact that they are good for nothing but undesirable, unskilled occupations. The "mud-sill" theory of society has come back with a vengeance, and likewise the good old argument that schooling for the ordinary man must teach him to know his place, to keep it, and to be content with it.

On the curious assumption that this represents a democratic American view of education, the United States Commissioner of Education in 1947 appointed a Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth. In the same year an Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program was launched under the auspices of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The points of view of both programs—phrased in such terms as "life-adjustment" and "basic needs of high-school youth"—were so similar that the state project eventually affiliated with the national one, and the controlling body adopted the name "Steering Committee of the Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program and the Illinois Life Adjustment Education Program."

The "life-adjustment" ideology was widely held in professional educational circles throughout the country. It was embodied, for example, in a volume entitled *Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living* which was published, also in 1947, by Teachers College, Columbia University. "Fundamentally," the authors announced, "this concept of curriculum development is one in which the basic problems and situations of everyday living in our democracy, which are central in life itself, also become central in the education of learners." The idea was neatly summed up in one of the section titles, "Life Situations Are the Curriculum; Organized Bodies of Subject Matter Are Resource Areas."¹

The national Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth sized up with considerable realism the difficulties it would have to overcome in eliminating intellectual training from the schools. "Traditional subjects are logically organized," it had to admit, and the contrast with what it was proposing was all too obvious. "Effective teachers are enthusiastic about the subjects they teach," the Commission lamented, and such enthusiasm was

¹ Florence B. Stratemeyer and others, *Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living* (New York, 1947), pp. 76, 89.

going to be hard to stamp out. The public, too, presented a problem, for the Commission regretfully observed that "there are enormous continuing pressures for teachers and principals to continue doing the things they do well"—a hopelessly old-fashioned attitude that would require a good deal of propaganda to eradicate. "The Commission," according to its own modest statement, "recognizes these difficulties and it has no panacea for overcoming them."¹ Refreshing as it is to encounter a group of educators without a panacea, one cannot escape the feeling that under such circumstances the Commission desperately needed one.

It is well that the Commission refused to recognize as an additional difficulty what others might regard as such. The curriculum, it asserted, should be planned "to meet the imperative needs of all youth," but the Commission did not believe in giving first consideration to the needs of pupils now in school. "Even more, it is concerned with the types of education needed by the adolescent youth who drop out of school because their needs are not being met realistically."² Apparently the Commission felt itself fully prepared to crack down on the students who were attending school in order to learn, should they show resentment at being penalized in order to lure back into the classroom those who never wanted to be there in the first place.

IV

Refusing to be daunted by difficulties like these, the sponsors of "life-adjustment" education have made heroic efforts to put into effect the program which neither teachers, parents, citizens, nor pupils apparently want. The most valiant (and probably the most expensive) effort has been made in the state of Illinois. Here the Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program has been at work for five years. At least sixteen printed bulletins have appeared, to say nothing of mimeographed documents of many kinds. Questionnaires have gone out, IBM machines have clicked off the results, and sponsors of the program have carried the glad tidings at public expense to all parts of the state.

¹ *Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth*, pp. 11-12.

² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

The Illinois Curriculum Program (to use the shortened name that is now accepted) comprises some seven "local studies basic to curriculum development."¹ The last three of these reveal most clearly the anti-intellectualism implicit in the thinking of this group of professional educators. But before examining them we need to look at the four preceding studies in order to grasp the full context.

The first three studies are unexceptionable in purpose and principle. The first, called the "Holding Power Study," aims to discover how many potential students fail to attend high school or to continue in it until graduation, and what characteristics are typical of the pupils who drop out. The next two studies are based on the legitimate premise "that the vast majority of the youth who drop out of school come from families low in the income scale." Accordingly, a "Participation in Extra-Class Activities Study" looks into the question of whether such students are being "'included out' of the fun-yielding, prestige-bearing extra-class activities of the high school." And a "Hidden Tuition Costs Study" undertakes to bring to light the various incidental fees, subscriptions, and expenses which a pupil must pay in order to be a self-respecting participant in the complete high-school program, and which consequently bar the way to poorer students even in a nominally tuition-free public school.² Such information, when gathered accurately and efficiently, is obviously desirable if undemocratic discrimination is to be eliminated, as it must be, from the American educational system. Note, however, that the data provided by the two last-mentioned studies can afford no justification for tampering with the curriculum itself, for nonattendance is treated as the consequence of economic factors entirely independent of the school's offerings of subject-matter.

The fourth, "The Guidance Study," is designed to discover (with the idea of remedying) defects in the "pattern of organized personnel services for students," that is, services "concerned with the educational, occupational, social, and personal adjustments of

¹ Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program, Bulletin No. 13, *How the Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program Basic Studies Can Help You Improve Your High School* ([Springfield], May, 1951), pp. 8-9. These publications will be cited hereafter in the form: ISSCP, Bulletin No. 13.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 11-13.

young people."¹ The principal danger here is the tendency to overemphasize the auxiliary services of the school at the expense of its central purpose of intellectual training. The first stated assumption of this study—"that it is part of the proper business of the secondary school to meet the significant felt needs of youth"²—embodies, of course, the fallacy exhibited by the statement quoted and criticized at the beginning of this paper, for it fails to recognize the necessity for qualifying the term "felt needs" in such a way as to distinguish educational needs from others.

The "Guidance Study" is only a step in the direction of substituting vaguely conceived and heterogeneous educational objectives for clear and attainable ones. The "Follow-Up Study," the fifth in the series, is a leap into the very center of the bog. Its starting-point is a document entitled "Problems of High School Youth,"³ which is described as "the list of real-life problems of youth around which the entire study centers."⁴ Five separate questionnaires are based upon this list, and the answers are supposed to reveal what parents, citizens, teachers, and pupils "think is the job of the secondary school."⁵

The problems are divided into eight groups, each of which consists of from three to twelve separate items. The study is to be a statistical one, and the managers of the project consistently assert that the list contains "56 real-life problems."⁶ A simple count shows only 55, but such a procedure as counting is traditional, I know, and hence outmoded. The two largest groups of problems are "Spending Leisure Time Wholesomely and Enjoyably" and "Developing an Effective Personality." These include such items as "the problem of acquiring the social skills of dancing, playing party games, doing parlor stunts, etc." and "the problem of improving one's personal appearance." In other groups one finds such items as "the problem of selecting a 'family dentist' and acquiring the habit of visiting him systematically" and "the problem

¹ ISSCP, Bulletin [No. 1], *Guide to the Study of the Curriculum in the Secondary Schools of Illinois* (August, 1948), p. 33.

² ISSCP, Bulletin No. 13, p. 13.

³ ISSCP, Bulletin No. 11, *How to Conduct the Follow-Up Study* (August, 1950), pp. 30-32.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 12, 13.

of developing and maintaining wholesome boy-girl relationships."¹

Planted inconspicuously in the list² are a few items like these: "the problem of acquiring the ability to study and help solve economic, social, and political problems"; "the problem of making one's self a well-informed and sensitive 'citizen of the world'"; and "the problem of acquiring the ability to distinguish right from wrong and to guide one's actions accordingly." There is not the slightest suggestion anywhere in the entire study that these problems are any more important or any more difficult to solve than the others, or that the school should spend more than a small fraction of its time upon them.

The authors apparently think that it is enough to say—in another pamphlet, not circulated with the list or questionnaires themselves—that "neither the order in which needs are given nor the amount of space devoted to each need is indicative of the relative significance of the different needs."³ This is an insult to the citizen's intelligence. No preliminary disclaimer could save me from the charge of disordered thinking if I offered the following as an inventory of my possessions: (1) library, (2) sauce pans, (3) umbrella, (4) furniture, (5) fountain pen, (6) house and lot, (7) doormat, (8) automobile, (9) clothing, (10) lawnmower.

The list of "Problems of High School Youth" is not a hasty private memorandum. It is a formal statement of educational principles, drawn up by those who purport to be specialists in the matter, and circulated to large numbers of citizens under the auspices of the highest public educational authorities of the state. It is professedly designed to stimulate serious thinking about "the job of the secondary school."

The questionnaires not only fail to encourage serious thinking about educational problems; they do their best to prevent it. The average citizen possesses a sense of proportion even if the educators do not, but the questionnaires forbid him to bring it to bear on educational problems. No one is permitted to add anything to the list, or even to indicate how important he thinks a given problem to be, relative to the others. Concerning each listed item

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-32, items E10, B2, C3, G1.

² *Ibid.*, items F6, F7, B9.

³ ISSCP, Bulletin [No. 1], p. 10.

the respondent is asked to indicate whether he thinks the secondary school should help satisfy the particular need. To answer "no" is to put oneself down as a calloused enemy of social welfare. To answer "yes" permits one to indicate further whether one considers it "very important," "important," or "not particularly important" for the school to give this help.¹ That is all. A parent, citizen, teacher, or pupil may think two items "important," yet may also believe that one is a hundred times as important as the other and ought to receive a hundred times the emphasis. The questionnaires offer no means whatever of indicating this simple but profoundly important value judgment.

Once a sufficient number of persons have been induced to mark a given item "very important," the educator assumes that he has a mandate to remake the curriculum in such a way as to make this item central. And by deliberately omitting any sort of reference to mathematics, science, history, foreign languages, and English grammar, he saves himself from the embarrassing possibility of receiving a public mandate in favor of disciplined intellectual training. The "life-adjustment" propagandist not only refuses to lead public opinion toward a sound conception of education, he even refuses to let the public lead him in that hateful direction.

The abdication of educational responsibility goes even deeper than this. All thoughtful men would agree that the school should assist the student to grapple with "economic, social, and political problems." The great disciplines of history, economics, sociology, and political science have come into existence as the result of hundreds—indeed thousands—of years of serious effort by able men to do precisely this in an orderly, systematic, cogent way. Genuine scholars in these fields do not promise quick and easy solutions. But they do believe, with good reason, that serious, sustained, objective, critical inquiry into these matters will equip a man with the knowledge, and develop in him the maturity of judgment, that are essential to intelligent and effective action. This, however, is too slow and laborious a process for the professional educator to contemplate. He wishes adolescents to "help solve" these problems, and to do so without history, without economics, without sociology, without political science—disciplines whose very names

¹ ISSCP, Bulletin No. 11, pp. 34 *et seqq.*

are treated as if they were obscene and are hidden behind euphemisms like "social studies" in most writings on the public schools.

Should the citizen inquire how these educators plan to solve "the problem of acquiring the ability to study and help solve economic, social, and political problems," he will find no answer in the documents of the Illinois Curriculum Program. The sponsors of the program are supposed to be experts in method. They pretend to know how the school should accomplish its ends. But they insist that the public must take their professional competence on faith; and they deny, with particular vehemence, the right of scholars and scientists in the recognized fields of knowledge to examine the soundness or adequacy of what they propose. The public has no function save to indicate that it wants its children to "help solve economic, social, and political problems." The rest must be left to the professional educators, who alone know all the answers. In business this is called "selling a bill of goods." In education, one can be sure, the expression would be decently polysyllabic.

Implicit in the national "life-adjustment" program and in the Illinois studies is the belief that the traditional intellectual disciplines of the curriculum have nothing to do with satisfying the "real-life needs" of modern students. They are "non-functional," justifiable as college-preparatory subjects, but not very important even as such. They are not even valuable in themselves, as an enrichment of men's lives. Throughout the previous millennia of human history the cultivation of the arts, of literature, of history and philosophy, of science and mathematics has been deemed the highest use of leisure time, the principal justification, indeed, for the existence of leisured classes in a busy workaday world. Now that leisure is available to all, however, these things are supposed by the educators to have lost their value. Just as these educators believe that sixty per cent of the population must be "adjusted" to a lifetime of unskilled, undesirable labor, so they seem to believe that the masses of men cannot possibly acquire the intelligence, discrimination, and taste to use leisure as wisely and nobly as the privileged classes of the past were able frequently to do.

Consider the specific activities mentioned in the Illinois study under the heading of "Spending Leisure Time Wholesomely and Enjoyably." Here is the list, in the exact order in which the items

are enumerated: athletic games and sports, gardening, camping, fishing, "tinkering" hobbies, sketching, painting, designing, collecting art objects, singing, playing a musical instrument, selecting and enjoying good music, getting the best out of the radio, selecting and enjoying good motion pictures, selecting and enjoying good books and magazines, dancing, playing party games, doing parlor stunts, taking an enjoyable part in dramatic activities, selecting and enjoying good plays.¹ The list is a perfect epitome of the professional educators' confusions. Note the outrageous mingling of the trivial and the important. Note the importation into the curriculum of activities that are learned elsewhere as fully as they ever need to be. Note the failure to recognize that learning to select and enjoy good books is something vastly different in kind and in complexity from learning to do parlor stunts.

By dint of tremendous effort society has at last assured to all Americans the privilege of leisure. The professional educators are joining the crassest commercial perverters of culture in an effort to see that most of this leisure is frittered away. And they are going a step further by insisting that the school must deliberately teach our young men and women to cast aside every distinction among cultural values.

V

In defense of the follow-up study, the author of the list of "Problems of High School Youth" and of the questionnaires based upon it has made the following statement to me:

From studies previously conducted . . . it was believed that the principal reason that youngsters dropped out of high school was that they saw little or no relationship between the subjects they were studying and the life problems of which they were more or less acutely aware. Once the legal school-leaving age had been reached by these youngsters, it seemed apparent that they could be kept in school only if the courses they were taking were in some way or ways more convincingly related to their life problems—that if this were not done the values potential in the high school courses in literature, science, history, foreign languages, etc., would probably be lost to them by virtue of their departure from the institution

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 31, section E.

When a community which has seen fit . . . to utilize the *Follow-Up Study* as a starting point for its discussions has worked out a reasonably satisfactory agreement as to what life problems (whether these problems be those included in the printed materials of the study, or others not suggested therein, or some combination of both, is not material) are to be utilized to make the courses taught in the local high school make more sense to more pupils . . . , the next obvious step is that of incorporating these problems in the courses and/or extra-class activities to which they sensibly relate. There is no thought . . . that these problems are to constitute the whole of the curriculum or to replace any of the existing courses in the curriculum. Instead, the purpose in spotting the life problems which the community believes to be important, and in treating these problems in the courses to which they sensibly relate, is to make the courses make more sense to more pupils and patrons, and thus to keep more pupils in high school in order that they may be more fully benefited by the secondary school. It is recognized, of course, that any school that might see fit to design some new offering around some sensible cluster of various of these problems might with propriety do so!¹

This puts the matter in the best possible light, but there are many difficulties in the way of accepting it as a valid description of the purposes and probable consequences of the study.

In the first place, two of the "studies previously conducted" came up with conclusions quite different from those stated in the opening sentence of this letter. The "Participation in Extra-Class Activities Study" showed "that the vast majority of the youth who drop out of school come from families low in the income scale."² And this, and its companion "Hidden Tuition Costs Study," attributed the fact to obvious financial barriers. The "Follow-Up Study" shifts ground, without explanation or justification, to the totally different contention "that the principal reason that youngsters dropped out of high school was that they saw little or no relationship between the subjects they were studying and the life problems of which they were more or less acutely aware."

In the second place, it is difficult to see why a student who is indifferent to school should recognize as a personal, compelling, "real-life" need the "problem of making one's self a well-informed

¹ Letter from Harold C. Hand, Urbana, Ill., February 25, 1952. Quoted with the writer's permission.

² ISSCP, Bulletin No. 13, p. 11.

and sensitive 'citizen of the world.'" If he can see no practical point in history, geography, arithmetic, and grammar, I doubt if he will rush back to school filled with a burning desire for sensitivity to world citizenship.

In the third place, the problem of relating the subject matter of a course to the life problems of the students enrolled in it is primarily a matter of intelligent and imaginative teaching. The important thing is for the teacher to know his subject and his student's problems well enough to make the connection. This elaborate polling of entire communities is not going to help him in any appreciable way. Especially is this true when the sponsors of the program abdicate all responsibility for indicating how their goals—sublime and foolish alike—are actually to be realized in the classroom.

These are perhaps minor points. There are two others that require more extended examination.

In the fourth place, then, if the object of the study were simply to demonstrate to the public and the student the immense practical value of the recognized scientific and scholarly disciplines, why is this clear and admirable purpose never stated in straightforward fashion in any part of the voluminous literature of the Illinois Curriculum Program? Why are references to the basic academic subjects so carefully and completely avoided in the documents distributed to the public? If the sponsors genuinely desired to safeguard the fundamental intellectual disciplines and to enhance public esteem for them, they showed the most wretched incompetence in planning their study. Every document placed in the hands of citizens or pupils teaches the recipient to think of the schools in utterly non-intellectual terms. No sentence suggests that intellectual training can answer "real-life" problems. Pupils are asked to say "what we should teach you,"¹ but are not permitted to mention any of the recognized fields of knowledge. Parents are informed that the schools "desire to teach all the children of all the people whatever they need to know,"² and are asked to indicate what these things are. But they, too, may not specify intellectual training in the basic academic subjects. Can anyone seriously believe that this is a bona-fide effort to preserve "the values potential

¹ ISSCP, Bulletin No. 11, p. 15.

² *Ibid.*, p. 17.

in the high school courses in literature, science, history, foreign languages, etc."?

In the fifth place and finally, the published literature of the Illinois Curriculum Program cannot possibly be reconciled with the assertion of the private letter that "there is no thought. . . that these problems are to constitute the whole of the curriculum or to replace any of the existing courses in the curriculum." Even the introduction to the bulletin containing the questionnaires explains: "The Follow-Up Study furnishes the data which can be used to arrive at broad policies (consensus) which must be obtained before a faculty or administrator may safely embark on material changes in the scope and content of the secondary school curriculum."¹ In its very first publication the Illinois Curriculum Program announced that its goal for the curriculum was "common learnings organized in comparatively large units on the basis of youth and societal needs,"² and relegated to the status of electives the "regular courses. . . in English, mathematics, science, foreign language, . . . and the like."³

By the time of its ninth bulletin the Steering Committee of the Program had grown bolder. This publication, entitled *New College Admission Requirements Recommended*, contained the following specific complaint:

The specification by the colleges of certain high school courses to be taken by all students seeking college entrance, sets definite limitations to curriculum revision. If a considerable block of courses must be retained in the high school to provide for the preparation of students who hope to go to college, the opportunity to re-examine the total high school curriculum and to replan the program in terms of the needs of all high school youth is thereby curtailed. For example, school administrators and teachers frequently mention the restrictive effect on their revision of the curriculum of the specification by some of the colleges that only high school majors and minors in English, foreign language, mathematics, science, and social studies will be counted for admission. The effect of such college entrance specifications is particularly limiting for smaller schools which comprise the great majority of Illinois high schools. The smaller schools cannot afford to provide

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

² ISSCP, Bulletin [No. 1], p. 6.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

a large number of courses; hence, when courses are specifically required for college entrance, most of them must also be the courses taken by students not going to college¹

In the *larger* high schools, the bulletin goes on to say, intellectual training could still be retained, but only "to provide for the specialized needs of parts of the student body." The example used is the group of students planning to go into engineering. These ought to have an opportunity to acquire some competence in mathematics, if convenient for the school to offer it. But "the Committee recognizes that smaller high schools will not always be able to provide a sufficient variety of specialized courses to meet the needs for special programs of all its graduates. In such cases, the colleges are urged to make provisions for the basic specialized work with as little handicap to the student as possible."² This is the end result toward which the Illinois Curriculum Program is tending. Intellectual training will continue to be offered to an elite group in a few of the larger and wealthier schools, but the graduate of the typical high school must acquire it when and how he can. And the colleges are urged to deal gently with those who come to them mentally handicapped through no fault of their own.

VI

The "Follow-Up Study," which we have examined at length, is itself followed up by others, and these, it is sometimes alleged, will cure any defects in the preceding ones. Particularly emphasized, in this connection, is the sixth, a series of "Local Area Consensus Studies." The documents and procedures to be used are still being "pre-tested and otherwise readied for the field,"³ but the plan is outlined in already published bulletins of the Program.

In this study the starting-point at last is the school program itself. This is considered to be composed of at least nineteen "subject or service areas." The recognized academic subjects of English, foreign languages, mathematics, science, and social studies are specifically named among these "areas," and a separate

¹ ISSCP, Bulletin No. 9, pp. 5-6.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

³ ISSCP, Bulletin No. 13, p. 15.

study is to be conducted for each of the nineteen. Mathematics is used as an example. To begin with, "some recognized leader in this curriculum area will be asked to draw up a concise statement of the principles which would probably govern, and of the chief purposes which would probably be striven for, in the mathematics program of a really up-to-date high school." This statement will be submitted to what is called a "jury," which is to include at least one university specialist in "mathematics education," along with public-school teachers, administrators, and other professional educators. The statement, revised by the jury and cast into question form, will be used as the basis of questionnaires and then of local discussions by teachers, pupils, and citizens. Ultimately each local participant will receive a second questionnaire and will be asked "to indicate which, if any, of the principles or purposes of its mathematics program he believes his school should attempt better to implement or achieve." Once a consensus of opinion has been reached locally, "the central leader-and-jury group will . . . supply the school in question with an instrument designed to enable the local school to work out *its own plan* of concrete and specific ways of making each of the desired improvements in its mathematics program."¹

The most charitable thing to be said about the nineteen enormously complex and costly studies here projected is that they do not intensify the anti-intellectualism implicit in the "Follow-Up Study." But they certainly have little chance of reversing or even checking that disastrous tendency. Even assuming that the specialist in mathematics education on the "jury" turns out to be a mathematician and not another professor of education, he has no chance whatever of calling in question any of the basic assumptions of the Curriculum Program or of counteracting the anti-intellectualist characteristics that have been fortified by the preceding studies. The scholarly validity of such an enterprise as this cannot be attested at so late a stage by the mere participation of one or two scholars, capable of being outvoted on every question. The only review of the final recommendations that could carry weight in this direction would be review by a committee representing the national learned society in the field and empowered to reject the entire pro-

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-18.

gram if its structure was deemed unsound from the scholarly point of view. Anything less is mere academic window-dressing.

Actually this curious procedure of passing each proposal from group to group is not as pointless as it seems. It is one of the standard devices by which professional educators filter out every germ of an idea different from theirs and make sure that any final proposal is completely their own, even though they have maintained the pretense of consulting the opinions of citizens and scholars.

The utility of this device is beautifully illustrated by the seventh and last of the studies of the Illinois Curriculum Program, embodied in a volume entitled *The Schools and National Security*. This was done in the grand manner. "More than twenty-five hundred professional educators and laymen" were involved, the foreword proudly announces.¹ There were three great panels. Panel I consisted of twelve distinguished discussants, representative, beyond all cavil, of important areas of American public and professional life.² Their names give prestige and standing to the report, and seemingly guarantee that the conclusions are something more than a rehash of the professional educators' peculiar notions. But what were these discussants permitted to do? The panel was brought together under the chairmanship of a professional educator, and its members were asked to discuss "the nature, dimensions, and requirements of the national security situation" and the impact upon society of the measures that are likely to be adopted.³ The implications for education were *not* up for discussion. The sponsors of the study made this absolutely clear: "It should be noted that the purpose of this meeting was *not* to talk about education; this was to come later."⁴ This statement from the introduction is most revealing. Men in public and professional life might be expected to have ideas about education, but for them to have expressed their views on the matter would have been an impertinent intrusion into the field reserved exclusively for professional educators. To make sure that such extraneous ideas did not creep into the

¹ ISSCP, Bulletin No. 16, *The Schools and National Security*, p. iii.

² For the roster, see *ibid.*, p. v.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*

record, no less than six professional educators sat with the panel as "recorders," and they wrote the summary of its discussions. After the members of the panel approved this text, they were honorably discharged from all further service.

Then began the great filtering process. Panel II, made up of eighteen school administrators and professors of education, took the report of the first set of discussions (now cast into six chapters of the projected volume), and drew up, in four additional chapters, their own statement of the "Major Educational Implications of the National Security Situation." Lest the educators on Panel II should have become contaminated by ideas expressed in the original discussions, the whole was filtered again. The ten chapters produced thus far were passed on to Panel III, whose 130 members consisted of professional educators and "Parent-Teacher Association and school board leaders generally regarded as outstanding."¹ The 23 "subgroups" of this panel produced 23 more chapters describing "what they thought the national security program of the schools ought to be in regard to each of the subject areas of the school, its guidance program, . . . and so on."² Trial copies of the entire report went to 2,000 more educators and Parent-Teacher Association leaders for discussion. Three educators undertook to revise all parts of the report on the basis of the suggestions received. And the final document was "sieved"—the word is from the introduction³—by the august Steering Committee of the Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program. The final conclusions are simon-pure educationalism, warranted free from pollution by any unapproved educational ideas that might have seeped into the spring from which the report ostensibly took its rise.

Chapter 30, dealing with the "Social Studies," is worth looking at in detail. The "subgroup" of eight which was responsible for its drafting contained four professors of education and one school superintendent, so that the professional educators were in a position to vote down any unorthodox, scholarly ideas that might conceivably have come from the two high-school teachers and the college professor of social science who constituted the minority group.⁴

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. xi-xii.

No such unorthodoxies have crept in. Because the theme is "national security," some of the old ideas are dressed in new costumes, just as the chorus of a Broadway revue sometimes does a number with muskets and a flag to remind the audience that a war is on. But the chapter as a whole gives the reader the comfortable impression that the world crisis boils down to a slight reshuffle of the old familiar "real-life" needs. The first task of the social studies, the report begins, is to "reduce the tensions and meet the *needs* of children and youth." Absent is any idea that the nation is in danger, and that it may require of its future citizens some very hard thinking, not about their personal problems first of all, but about the means of national survival. Someone else can train them to do that job. The social studies cannot waste their time on the nation's problems when the tensions of young people are there to be reduced. "If we neglect the tensions," says the report, "we neglect also drives, motivations, and interests. We neglect the many personal life problems of youth. We run the risk of being academic." God forbid!

"Reducing the tensions of young people,"—this is the summary—"illuminating the social realities, and developing an understanding and practice of democratic values—these are our basic tasks in peacetime. *They are also our basic tasks in a period of defense or national emergency or total war.* The tasks do not differ from period to period."¹

The vaguenesses and ambiguities of the program do not differ from period to period either. Back again are the grandiose old promises, unsupported by any statement of the means to be employed: "develop a constructively critical attitude toward foreign policy," and "develop an understanding of the ways of living, attitudes, and ideologies of different nationalities throughout the world."² Back again is the dear old muddle-headedness that poses such questions as "Why do nations like India waver in their loyalty to the United States when the United States is friendly to India?"³ without bothering to consider whether loyalty is something that a sovereign nation is ever supposed to owe to another.

Back again, too, are the marvelous trivia into which the educa-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 221.

² *Ibid.*, p. 230.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 229.

tors throw themselves heart and soul. Ask the students, the report recommends, to "make studies of how the last war affected the dating pattern in our culture."¹ Here we have "life-adjustment" education in a nutshell.

VII

Let no one be lulled into the fatal belief that the professional educators are merely re-opening the old debate concerning the relative value of different intellectual disciplines. No one doubts that it is, and has always been, legitimate to ask such questions as these: Should modern languages be substituted for ancient ones? Should physics and chemistry occupy a larger place in the curriculum relative to the classics? Should economics and political science and sociology replace part of the offering in history in the high school? These *were* the issues that educational thinkers discussed in days gone by. But these debates are things of the past in professional educational circles. Programs like "life adjustment" education involve the rejection of all these different alternatives. The ancient languages have virtually disappeared from the high schools, but the modern foreign languages are being buried alive with them in a common, unmarked grave. Latin grammar, it was once argued, does not help with the understanding of English grammar, but now grammar of any kind has become anathema to the educators. The classics and the humanities are departing, but is their place being taken in the high-school curriculum by rigorous training in biology, physics, chemistry, mathematics? Professional biologists, physicists, chemists, and mathematicians are all but unanimous in saying that it is not. After sacrificing everything connected with the past, out of a pretended devotion to the present, are high-school educators turning out students well trained in economics, political science, sociology, and recent history? To ask the question is to answer it.

Most professional educators today are *not* talking about substituting one scholarly discipline for another. They stopped talking about that years ago. They are talking—as clearly as their antipathy for grammar and syntax permits them to talk—about the elimination of all the scholarly disciplines. They know per-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

fectly well what they are doing when they look at the present-day world crisis and then solemnly recommend that the schools contribute to national security, not by emphasizing history and economics and political science, but by asking their students to "make studies of how the last war affected the dating pattern in our culture." They know what they are doing, but do we?

One interpretation fits the facts as a glove fits the hand. It was stated succinctly to me in a personal letter from a fellow historian who has devoted as much time and effort to cooperation with professional educators as any scholar in the field. Though I differ with him (as I shall indicate in a moment) concerning the course of action we ought to adopt, I quote his letter in full, omitting only the signature and the purely personal concluding paragraph:

I read with great interest your article on "Aimlessness in Education,"¹ and assure you that I share your feelings quite fully. Perhaps in times past I have been more closely associated with the problem than most of my colleagues in history, and it seems to me that there are one or two facts that must be taken into account.

First, I think we should recognize the fact that the public school system in this country has ceased to be concerned primarily with education. It has become an agency of society to offset both juvenile delinquency and the possible competition of teen-age youth for jobs. How successfully these objectives have been [met] is a matter of opinion, I presume.

Some school administrators admit this very frankly. It means that they must try to keep the youngsters in school satisfied or entertained sufficiently to make them want to continue in school. Academic standards of a necessity have been abolished; promotion is chronological; the subjects to which there is no royal road have been more or less eliminated from the curriculum. That would include such items as foreign languages, even history (though public pressure requires the teaching of American history) and specialized mathematics. Some school administrators view this with regret; others approve of it and are enthusiastic about helping to equalize all by preventing bright students from being able to do any extra work outside of school hours.

It seems to me that the development has gone so far that it is idle to become angered about it. I think it is best for us to direct our attention to seeing how, in view of this situation, we can make

¹ *Scientific Monthly*, LXXV, 109-116 (August, 1952). This article discussed certain aspects of the Illinois Curriculum Program briefly, together with evidences of aimlessness found in other educational writings.

it possible for students with ability and interest to acquire an education during the school years. Private schools, of course, are able to maintain educational standards, ideals, and practices. I think it would be a mistake from the point of view of the conservation of our national mental resources to prevent able pupils from getting an education if their only avenue is the public school. That is the problem and the danger.

I sympathize with our colleagues at Illinois who seem to have become aroused over the problem, but I think our best efforts should be directed to finding a formula whereby education, at least for those who have ability, can be preserved in the midst of this overwhelming social demand upon the schools. It is, of course, unfortunate that there have been some among the so-called leaders of education who have tried to rationalize the situation and talk in terms of real education, when they know that it no longer is the main aim. Some of them, I am sure, are self-deceived, but there are others who have more intelligence and whose public utterances must be regarded as hypocritical. But let's try to save education as you and I understand it . . .

If the policy-makers of our public schools are inspired by purposes like these—and ample evidence supports the view that many of them are—then two ways are open for those of us who believe in preserving the modicum of intellectual training without which the nation cannot possibly survive in the modern world. One is the way suggested in this letter. We can accept the situation as it is and attempt to discover a means of providing intellectual training for a select few somewhere in the interstices of the system. That, I believe, would be to fight a losing battle. Too few students can be trained in that way; too many of the ablest young men and women of the nation will be condemned by such an arrangement to intellectual starvation. But there is a deeper reason. By its very nature a school cannot be neutral on the question of respect for intellectual effort, any more than a church can be neutral on the question of virtue. If it does not foster respect for the thing it was established to promote, then it inevitably fosters the opposite. A nonintellectual school is an anti-intellectual force in society. And to expect that intellectual training can be nurtured in the bosom of an institution which openly denies intellectual values is like expecting the cat to nurture a nest of young robins.

There is, however, another answer. That is to reaffirm our belief in the value of intellectual training to all men, whatever their

occupation, whatever their background, whatever their income or their position in society. This is to retrace our steps, I grant. It is to retrace them back to that period when professional educators really believed in education and when public-school leaders really believed in democracy. Instead of saying, with the apostles of "life-adjustment" education, that sixty per cent of our people must be taught contentment with their lot as hewers of wood and drawers of water, let us say, as did the friends of public schools in New Jersey in 1838:

We utterly repudiate as unworthy, not of freemen only, but of men, the narrow notion that there is to be an education for the poor as such. Has God provided for the poor a coarser earth, a thinner air, a paler sky? . . . Have not the cotter's children as keen a sense of all the freshness, verdure, fragrance, melody, and beauty of luxuriant nature as the pale sons of kings? Or is it on the mind that God has stamped the imprint of a baser birth, so that the poor man's child knows with an inborn certainty that his lot is to crawl, not climb? It is not so. God has not done it. Man cannot do it. Mind is immortal. Mind is imperial. It bears no mark of high or low, of rich or poor. It asks but freedom. It requires but light.¹

The founders of our public-school system subscribed to this belief. Their opponents did not. "It must be acknowledged," wrote Alexis de Tocqueville in 1840, "that in few of the civilized nations of our time have the higher sciences made less progress than in the United States. . . . Many Europeans, struck by this fact, have looked upon it as a natural and inevitable result of equality; and they have thought that if a democratic state of society and democratic institutions were ever to prevail over the whole earth, the human mind would gradually find its beacon lights grow dim, and men would relapse into a period of darkness."² Tocqueville, one should note, did not accept this conclusion, he merely reported it. But it was a view widely held, and the proponents of democratic education in the nineteenth century knew that they had to disprove it. They labored valiantly to do so, believing with Horace Mann in "the inherent superiority of any association or commun-

¹ Quoted in Ellwood P. Cubberley, *Public Education in the United States* (Boston, 1919), p. 146.

² Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Part II (1840), revised translation by Phillips Bradley (2 vols., New York, 1945), II, 35.

ity, whether great or small, where *mind* is a member of the partnership."¹ They knew that intellectual training is a serious business, demanding sustained effort and genuine devotion. "It may be an easy thing to make a Republic," wrote Horace Mann, "but it is a very laborious thing to make Republicans But if . . . a Republic be devoid of intelligence, it will only the more closely resemble an obscene giant . . . whose brain has been developed only in the region of the appetites and passions, and not in the organs of reason and conscience Such a republic, with all its noble capacities for beneficence, will rush with the speed of a whirlwind to an ignominious end."²

Our Republic need not rush—I pray that it will not rush—to such an end. But it is ominous, in these middle years of the twentieth century, that men who profess themselves to be both educators and democrats should consent to define democratic education in precisely the terms that have always been used by its bitterest enemies. In the writings of the "life-adjustment" school, democratic education is identified with intellectual mediocrity. Disciplined training in the arts and sciences is regarded as wasted if extended to the common people, who are supposed to require no training above and beyond that which is required for their own petty concerns. And a democratic populace is assumed to lack both the desire and the will to engage in serious and sustained intellectual effort.

In almost every realm of activity, the American people have refuted by their achievements the charge that democracy is incompatible with greatness. Let us not allow our public schools to be betrayed into the hands of those who believe and seek to demonstrate that democracy is incompatible with *intellectual* greatness.

¹ Horace Mann, "Fifth Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board of Education," Jan. 1, 1842, in Massachusetts Board of Education, *Annual Reports*, V (1842), 116.

² Horace Mann, "Twelfth Annual Report," Nov. 24, 1848, *ibid.*, XII (1849), 78-79.

WHOSE GOOD ENGLISH?

By LOUIS B. SALOMON

Brooklyn College

I think it's about time to warn the English-speaking public—in this country, anyway—that there's a growing conspiracy to give their language back to them, lock, stock, and barrel. The conspirators are, of all people, professional experts, teachers of English: members of that priesthood whom the public has long regarded as the custodians if not outright owners of the crown jewels and holy things of the King's English. And now some of them want to dump the whole glittering treasure into the public's lap, saying, "Here, take it; it's been yours all along. Don't ask *us* what to do with it. We only work here."

In case you don't even know this is going on, let me explain what has happened. In place of the old-fashioned grammarian who treated English as if it were a dead language, with a neat, logical code of laws, modern scholars and workers on the educational production-line lean more to the view that a language is made (and continually altered) by the people who use it—that it has no *a priori* rules whatever but only customs and usages which can be observed and tabulated like preferences in brands of cigarettes. For example, it's meaningless to say that *Whom do you want?* is right and *Who do you want?* is wrong; we should say only that among well-educated people 62% (or whatever) at the present time say *Whom* to 38% who say *Who*, and that therefore in such a sentence *Whom* is *standard* English. If we find that among people of moderate education *Who* makes the grade 90% of the time and among semi-illiterates 100%, these are usable statistics but not value judgments.

Thus, every time you bawl out a taxi-driver or deliver an after-dinner speech your manner of expression automatically becomes part of the way English is spoken and understood by people of your cultural level, and whether your locutions are used by the

majority or not is a purely statistical question. Whether you pen sophisticated epigrams for little magazines or scrawl the simplest obscenities on washroom walls, you are contributing your own little bits of building-stone to that tremendous pyramid of written communication which all the English teachers in the country can only try, at best, to shore up where it shows signs of weakness or strain. A sentence communicates an idea or starts a revolution not because a grammarian says it's correct but because for the eyes and ears of its audience it *is* correct by the surest test of all: it works.

II

So that's why some of the vigilantes who used to waylay your themes to flog each dangling participle and lynch every run-on sentence now seem to be looking for a chance to lay the language on your doorstep like a foundling and run like hell before you can catch them and ask them how to rear the brat. They're convinced that it's healthy, that it will grow up very well-adjusted provided it's never spanked or threatened or scrubbed or fussed over. They're perfectly willing to furnish you with its past history, and even help you keep records on its day-to-day development, but they'll only tell you what it has done, not what it should or should not do. The English grammar textbook of the future may approach its subject in the same spirit in which the Kinsey report tackled sex.

Now, in many respects this is a very fine thing, because there obviously is a great deal of flummery in the kind of language "rules" that for generations have been crammed down the throats of docile or perhaps just apathetic students all the way from grade school through college; and nobody should be asked to waste time studying mummified language forms which he never has used and never will use—which, furthermore, aren't even used by most of the teachers themselves outside the classroom. The only tangible result of all the attempts to teach a language of logical rules instead of real practice has been to make a lot of people self-conscious, like a little boy receiving a prize Bible for Sunday school attendance. It took the National Council of Teachers of English a long time to

get around to endorsing *It is me*, and even now a good many people find it so hard to believe that the expression they've always used is quite proper, that they gulp down their Adam's apple and bring out *It is I*, and then, by their own brand of analogy, of course, go proudly on to *They invited Mary and I for the week-end*. English teachers undoubtedly have a lot to answer for (including the half-educated conviction that this sentence would read more elegantly: "English teachers have a lot for which to answer").

And yet, despite the clear benefits of jettisoning such deadweight as the formal distinction between *shall* and *will*, the new trend if carried to extremes raises some questions of more than merely academic interest. For example, what if the public doesn't *want* to be crowned as the final arbiter of language use and abuse? I'm an English teacher, have been for twenty-five years, and I know how many people (not students) have asked me, "Is it right to say so-and-so?" and how many have been not merely unsatisfied but indignant when I've answered that usage rules in such matters, that if enough people say it it's right and if enough people avoid it it's wrong. They look at me as they'd look at a doctor who said, when they took their gripe to him: "My dear fellow, at any given time 51% of the population has virus infections of one sort or another. What do you want to do, be abnormal?" Most of the public, needless to say, will go on speaking and writing English in their accustomed fashion no matter what the pedagogues do or say about it, but that doesn't mean that there's no demand for a priestly caste to glorify and interpret the Tables of the Law. A lot of church-goers give the Ten Commandments quite a beating at home and in the market-place, but the anti-clerical movement has never got very far in this country.

People who abandon babies on your doorstep seldom ask in advance whether you want the gift or not. Maybe you're a dear old thing who's been pining for someone to love and cherish; maybe you're a flint-hearted wretch who'll be delighted to feed a prospective slave; but if you're an average sort of person you may hot-foot it to the nearest police station to get rid of the responsibility as fast as possible. There are institutions, you'll say, where my taxes support experts for the very purpose of handling these cases as they should be handled; why should *I* have to make decisions?

So you'd better ask yourself whether you want to be told about your language what the advertisers tell you about canned beans and TV sets and broadloom carpeting: "You are the Boss in this Land of Brands."

III

It's noteworthy that the more advanced proponents of the hands-off-the-language school tend to soft-pedal the title of English teacher and prefer to style themselves students of linguistics. Now, linguistics, or the study of the way language is actually used at any given time, is undoubtedly a useful branch of investigation, which can be pursued as scientifically as biochemistry or atomic physics. There's plenty of reason for objective and continued study of all varieties of verbal communication: the argot of con men, the circumlocution of government documents, the expressive flow of good literary prose, the clichés of business correspondence, the terse vigor of street-corner brawling. I just want to point out the danger of falling into the big scientific fallacy of our time: the fallacy of believing that the scientist's sole responsibility lies in amassing factual information. The greatest of the atomic scientists, like Einstein and Oppenheimer, have blasted this view, but it remains tempting—far too tempting—to all who want, for whatever reasons, to evade or abdicate responsibility for leadership. An even more dangerous temptation is to confuse the findings of pure scientific research with standards of value, a confusion leading to the doctrine that whatever is is right.

Now, there may be more basis for such a belief in regard to language usage than in certain other departments of human behavior, but I still feel that the linguistics people tread on shaky ground when they translate their statistical findings into value judgments. Evidence might conceivably show that 80% of the well-educated group who establish the pattern of "standard" English write *Try and do this*, but there should still be room for a grammarian, linguist—call him what you will—who argues that *Try to do this* is better: that is, slightly more precise in its conveyance of meaning and avoidance of even split-second ambiguity. Whether the second form really is better or not is an entirely different question; my point is that majority usage is no less subject to improvement

in phrasing than in the choice of soap, beer, or Congressmen. We'd have little patience with a child psychologist who argued that because 80% of all city children get their fingers blistered by open flames or steam pipes a child who has never had this experience is a prig. A sociologist who might report that 76% of the inhabitants of X County are pederasts or dope addicts or Klansmen would not forfeit his standing as a scientist by pointing out directions for desirable change. A literary critic in a scientific mood might discover that, say, 58% of the book-reading public reads Mickey Spillane and still not give up his efforts to improve the public taste.

IV

The science of linguistics, as long as it confines itself to tabulating the forms in which people do express themselves, performs a very useful function; but as soon as it goes beyond this it becomes curiously akin to the public opinion poll, which has also enjoyed its heyday in the past twenty years or so, which was supposed to have received its come-uppance in the presidential election of 1948 but is still flourishing like the greenest of bay trees. I can imagine the linguists who measure language propriety solely by statistics complaining bitterly if they should find Gallup poll methods applied to politics. A party's platform representing not what the party leaders think is best but merely what their public opinion samplers tell them a majority will vote for—isn't such a platform a sign of abdication in advance by those very men who are trying to sell themselves to the voters as leaders? And what if a later sampling by the pollsters suggests that popular sentiment on one or more issues has veered around—do you treat the platform like a recording tape: run it through the machine backward to erase the first impression, then superimpose a new sound-track contradicting the old?

Quite apart from the moral problems posed by such a process, there is the practical question of reliability. The 1948 pre-election polls showed the procedure to be fallible even when confined to "Yes," "No," and "Undecided" answers to a simple question; the evidence on which linguistic analysis operates comprises nothing

less than the entire body of written and spoken communication during the time under study. Even if you limit your research to documents, you have to decide arbitrarily which ones you're going to accept as truly representative, since people have a variety of reasons for writing with tongue in cheek, affecting locutions either more stilted or more folksy than their natural idiom.

But even if sampling procedures could be positively relied on, I don't accept the thesis that majority usage constitutes rightness. Language is so vital a function that it calls for the ministrations of experts, not merely to graph its vagaries but to work actively for the maintenance of highest efficiency. Not that the guidance of experts has much chance to prevail in the face of mass slovenliness, but their influence does serve as a brake upon indiscriminate leveling-out of the very distinctions that make language a sensitive, versatile instrument. We maintain a Bureau of Standards in spite of, perhaps because of, a widespread human tendency to give only fifteen ounces to the pound if not supervised.

What I'm arguing is not that any grammatical forms should be retained for their own sake or because they had a currency some time in the past, but only that our grammarians should continue to exert such pressure as they can in favor of forms they consider useful and against whatever is shoddy or fuzzy, no matter how many millions of satisfied users may acclaim it.

While it's true that bad grammar alone seldom causes really serious confusion of meaning in English (sloppy punctuation can foul up a sentence more), still there's no reason why any construction should go unchallenged if it gives rise to any *unnecessary* doubt, however slight—that is, when the language does possess grammatical forms that would prevent the fuzziness. Let me give a couple of examples, sentences quoted from books in my library:

1. What appearance did life present to the multitudinous man who in ever-increasing abundance the XIXth Century kept producing?
2. What the fungi do is attach themselves to plants, borrowing their foods from it as parasites. In so doing, they rot it.

By following the rules of the classical grammarian you could make each of these sentences not merely "correct" but more efficient

communication. In the first example, while there's no serious ambiguity after you've read the whole sentence, until you reach "the XIXth Century" you naturally think the multitudinous man is going to *do* something, not have something done to him. Changing *who* to *whom* would keep the reader from having to shift gears, as it were, in the middle of the sentence. In the second example it doesn't take much native shrewdness to see that the antecedent of *it* is *plants*, but why should the reader have to cast about even momentarily for a singular noun when changing *plants* to *a plant* would satisfy everybody? Yet these sentences come from books by well-known authors, edited and issued by reputable publishers, and such material naturally forms a substantial part of the evidence on which the linguistics people determine what is and what is not standard English.

The most the analysts can do, however, is estimate how many writers do ignore the agreement of pronoun and antecedent; they can't test the resulting loss in efficiency of communication. Even if the patterns illustrated by the above quotations were followed in 80% of the material printed in English I'd still feel that adhering to the old-fashioned "rules" in such cases would bring about a closer rapport between writer and reader. Any rules that will do that, I regard as useful rules, and I recommend vigorous police action to enforce them—or, if that's not feasible, then at any rate a lively propaganda campaign to keep them on the statute books.

V

As I said before, I hold no brief for the embalming of old useless forms. The taboo against *like* as a conjunction, for instance, is being subjected to increasing pressure among the groups who set the tone for standard English, and if the day should come when even English teachers write *He sings like his brother does*, I for one don't feel that the language will have suffered any great loss. Like (not as) most of my colleagues I've been fighting a rear-guard action for many years in defense of *as* and *as if*, but I'm afraid I've only succeeded in launching a boomerang which sometimes comes whizzing back in such an unnatural shape as *He looks as his father*—obviously a first cousin of *They invited Mary and I*.

Where the public, then, is busily trying to bury a form that's

outlived its usefulness if it ever had any, I'm all for pitching in and helping. But first let's make sure whether the corpse is really dead or whether it might be revived and, if so, made into a useful citizen. When a lifeguard at the beach rescues a waterlogged bather he doesn't eschew trying artificial respiration just because most of the onlookers shake their heads and say, "Poor fellow, he's a goner!"

I can't see any gain for anybody in reducing English teaching to the status of a spectator sport. My colleagues who are working in that direction may, I'm afraid, be cutting their own throats, because the more effectively they manage to sell the public the idea that whatever passes current is right, the less reason the public will find for supporting them. How many dollars will a congregation drop into the collection-box for a preacher whose sole text is a running analysis of the percentage of the population that doesn't attend church?

Conceivably the public may not care whether English teachers eat or not, but if there is any sentiment in favor of feeding them I'm willing to bet that the idea is to keep them alive as English teachers, that is, as a kind of traffic cop to tell the average person when to stop and when to move on, where he may park and where he may not. If English teachers don't want to be traffic cops—if they just want to stand on the corner and count the cars that try to beat the red light—then they might as well turn in their badges. Because sooner or later the taxpayers will (a) begin to wonder why the accident rate keeps going up, and (b) discover that a machine with an electric eye can do the counting more cheaply and more efficiently.

TEXTBOOKS AND THE TEACHING PROCESS

By BERNARD LEVY

The City College (New York)

Textbooks constitute almost the entire program of reading required during the four years of a student's residence in college. They are the point of departure for virtually every classroom session. And to a significant degree they determine the teacher's procedures in the classroom. In fact many, if not most, class hours are intended to appraise and, accordingly, to correct or amplify the student's understanding of the assignment he has read previously.

It would then seem profitable to consider some of the important limitations of textbooks. For it is precisely in those areas where the impersonal printed words of the textbook author fail that the rôle of the teacher as a person begins.

But written communication, even at levels far simpler than that of a textbook, is one of the subtlest of human arts. And the reasons for the relative success or failure of students in understanding a textbook assignment are accordingly subtle and complex in the extreme. Still, most of us will probably agree on certain fundamental reasons.

II

On that assumption, I am suggesting that the effectiveness of a textbook rests upon at least three qualities of its author: his style and command of language; his use and explanations of technical terminology; and his skill and timing in the presentation of the topics he treats. These are not isolated factors, of course. Moreover, they are counterbalanced by corresponding capacities or lack of capacities in the student: his ability to read discerningly, his familiarity with the technical terminology of

the discipline, and his knowledge of the subject matter prerequisite to the topic under consideration.

In reality, each of these skills of the writer and his student reader is the reverse side of the same medal. It would consequently seem advisable to consider them in turn from that two-fold point of view.

The first of these skills is being widely discussed at the moment. You repeatedly hear the charge that present-day students leave high school untrained to read discerningly. Many teachers, distressed at the results of textbook assignments, have come to share this opinion.

There is, however, a tendency to disregard the other side of the story. I believe all of us—students, teachers, and textbook authors—will agree on one plain truth: Textbooks are not usually written by stylists. They are not exemplary models of prose. They often do not achieve clarity of expression. The following quotation from a very recent, rather popular college text is perhaps not typical, but it is in no sense a unique example of textbook English:

The interrogative is formed by placing the subject at the beginning of the sentence with a comma, followed by the inverted question with a pronoun.

Perhaps pressure can be exerted upon publishers to improve the product. That is a very vital question, but it remains a question. Meanwhile, one must reckon with the present actuality and plan procedures accordingly. The teacher cannot in all conscience overlook the relatively inadequate level of textbook writing or the widespread lack of reading skills among his younger students.

I believe it is important to single out technical terminology as a second individual item for consideration. For textbooks are increasingly being written in what may be called the jargon of the discipline, with a stylized vocabulary and conventional phraseology of its own. This is of course not said in censure. Every discipline is constantly striving to express its accomplishments in the most precise terms. As a result, these terms are often completely parochial and so have meaning only for the initiated. In reality, each field of knowledge has come to have a vocabulary of

its own, which must be mastered with reasonable accuracy before one can read in it with profit.

These specialized vocabularies are difficult to acquire. The conscientious student will often find that the dictionary—even the largest dictionary—is not helpful in its definitions of many of the unknown technical terms he encounters. And when he seeks these definitions in his textbook by consulting the index, he is just as often frustrated. He frequently finds the definitions expressed in words and phrases as conventionalized or uninformative as the very terms that mystify him.

The following is an example from the first chapter, called “elementary topics,” of a relatively good college text in current use:

An algebraic term is said to be integral and rational in certain literal numbers if the term does not involve them or if it is the product of positive integral powers of the letters multiplied by a factor not involving them.

Some eight lines later the author adds,

Hereafter, unless otherwise stated, any term or polynomial to which we refer will be integral and rational in all literal numbers involved.

There is, I dare say, a bewildering quality in this prose for those of us who are not too familiar with the subject of the definition. The word *involve* will probably bedevil the student, even though it is just the word that covers the situation for a mathematician. Here is a textbook definition which is adequate in every regard, except in enlightening the average student reader. There is a tragic side to definitions of this sort. In time, if they recur, they will for many students slam the door shut to one of the most beautiful and symmetrical fields of human learning.

The terminology of the social sciences presents difficulties of the same sort—often for different reasons. Many of the abstractions used in these disciplines become progressively broader and vaguer through centuries of use. The word *liberalism*, for example, has been used in the past to connote that body of principles, like free speech and laissez-faire economics, which seeks to free the individual from governmental restraints. Today it serves to describe a contrary conviction. For liberalism has become the rallying cry of

those who advocate direct intervention by government as a corrective of our economic or social maladjustments.

Sharp differences in the meanings of abstractions of this sort are attributable not merely to chronology but also to geography or even to sheer personal attitude. The term *democracy* has a connotation in eastern Europe quite different from ours. And at least for some people, the term *corporation* has an implication charged with emotion.

Undeniably there is a vital need for adequate and informative definitions of the technical or abstract terms and symbols employed in the various disciplines of the curriculum. Ideally, these abstractions should be defined in language that the student can grasp and assimilate, if he is to become literate in the fields in which they are particularly used. Obviously the teacher must supply this need. It is not adequately met by textbooks, and it usually cannot be satisfied by the conventional terse formulae of a dictionary.

In his prose style and in his use of technical terminology, the textbook author is primarily concerned with matters of language. His goals are essentially accuracy, clarity, and simplicity, whoever his student readers may be. When he introduces a topic, however, he must necessarily be concerned with the background and preparation of the reader to whom he addresses himself.

He begins by assuming that his readers are of a certain average educational level and that they have some familiarity with the particular field he is discussing, or with a more or less closely allied one. In mathematics, for example, at least the operations of arithmetic are assumed; in language, the elements of syntax; in literature and the social sciences, some experience with the human equation; and in the laboratory sciences, some awareness of the natural phenomena about us.

These examples sound absurdly elementary. But many intelligent students who have grasped a mathematical theory cannot experience the joy of arriving at the correct answer to a problem because they are unskilled in the use of fractions. And others cannot come to feel the exquisite shadings of the subjunctive mood because they are puzzled by the word "clause."

The remedy for such situations as these is obviously beyond the

scope of a textbook. Only the teacher, through direct contact with his own particular student group, can personalize instruction and thus provide correctives for individual shortcomings of this nature.

III

In the light of these three preceding considerations, literacy, that is, the ability to read with understanding in the great fields of human knowledge, emerges as a most desirable product of general education. Presumably, no one would question the worth of such an objective. For this ability may well be applied by the student in many unforeseeable ways in his world of tomorrow, whereas the facts, data, and topics of today's assignment may soon be forgotten and dated.

But there would no doubt be much less agreement among us on the extent to which this objective should shape the curriculum in practice or on the specific methods which should be used to achieve it. And that is as it should be. Teaching in its most meaningful sense is an expression of an individual personality and techniques should vary accordingly.

It is in these terms that I am raising the following questions: How shall we train students to read analytically? Is it enough to use the home assignment as a point of departure for classroom discussion? Shall we take the time to motivate and explain an assignment in advance? Or indeed shall we meet the situation head on and analyze significant portions of the text itself during the class hour—in fact, scrutinize them in somewhat the same way that a lawyer pores over the essential points of a legal paper?

None of the procedures involved in these questions is new, of course. But of the three, the last, that of analyzing and explaining a text in class, has largely been discarded. It has probably been least commonly used in recent years. Should it be repossessed in some form to meet the needs of our present-day incoming students? What would it entail?

This technique of text analysis would probably lead the class into some general procedure of this sort: The student would participate most often with an open text before him. On the

basis of a home assignment, he might be required to establish by direct quotations what the textbook writer said, half said, or implied. He might be asked to interpret the meanings of certain specific passages, to explain the significance of individual words or proper names, or to quote directly from the text in support of his answers to particular questions. He would be called upon to make a clear differentiation between controlled facts and assumptions, validity and truth, qualified and unmodified asseverations, and a ruthless inquiry into the types of supporting evidence or argument upon which the author has rested his opinions.

Examinations might be planned to reflect these procedures. They could include short passages written by specialists on aspects of the course or selected from the textbook itself. The student might then be required to answer questions about each passage similar to those suggested for use in classroom sessions.

To the extent that this approach were used, it would reduce the amount of class time devoted to unnecessary discussion, to lecturing by the teacher, to student reports, to drill on facts, to visual aids—in fact, to any procedure not specifically and directly tied to text analyses. And by virtue of this approach, every teacher would be concerned with English language and style, regardless of his departmental affiliation. In teaching an assignment from a text on history, economics, hygiene, or indeed any field, he would lay stress on synonymy, emotional or argumentative tones of words, or the connectives which link the sentences and thoughts of an assignment. He would devote time to pointing up the effect achieved by a textbook writer who uses *preciseness* for *precision*, *disheartening* for *discouraging*, or *ostensibly* for *actually*. Again, the teacher who uses this approach must forego some of the aims of his own discipline. When he locks step pedagogically with his colleagues in the department of English, he is necessarily slowing the pace of his progress through the materials of his course.

These considerations raise important questions. Is it wise or even practical to request a teacher of economics, history, or hygiene, for example, to step out of departmental character in this way? Is it justified? I believe that it is, even if teachers must be retrained. For I am convinced that, so far as general education is concerned, the function of a teacher is to educate through his discipline rather than to prepare specialists in it.

I believe, moreover, that textbooks in a given discipline should be supplemented by selected readings from distinguished writers in the field. The speeches of Lincoln, the essays of Thoreau or Emerson, extracts from Jefferson are examples of readings that might be used in a course in American History. Such selections would lend themselves to rewarding linguistic analyses in class. And who will say that they do not amply compensate for the unstudied chapters of a textbook, which they will crowd out of a course?

In any case, the language departments have a particularly constructive opportunity to enhance the student's sensitivity to style and language. For they are obviously most directly concerned with written communication. Using examples of distinguished prose, they can, to an extent, offset the mediocrity of textbook writing.

But the completion of a year of required composition usually leaves the freshman far short of a reasonable accomplishment. And most students can realize significant benefits from courses in literature only with time, after abundant subsequent reading. Would it not be advisable then to prescribe a course directly concerned with some of the specific materials of effective expression—tonalities of words, the shades of meaning differentiating synonyms, and word order, for example—in which fine models of English prose would serve as a point of departure?

From this same point of view, it would seem appropriate for the foreign-language departments to revert at least partially to translation as an exercise in language. For it affords the most rigorous training with words. Effective translation does not require merely an ability to grasp the sense of a foreign idiom. At every turn, it demands careful searches through the vast resources of English for the particular terms and expressions that parallel the original.

IV

But it would seem thoroughly unwise in any circumstances to presume that the skill of discerning reading is the business of the language departments exclusively. It cannot really be acquired through any particular course or sequence. It is an end result of education.

In a very real sense, all the disciplines of the curriculum are concerned with communication. For that purpose, they have created specific values for terms like *modernism*, *valence*, *mood*, *root*, and *atom*, which are actually keys to literacy in their respective areas. It is in this light that the problem of technical terminology should be examined.

The techniques involved in formulating effective definitions for abstractions of the sort I have mentioned make the greatest demands on the skill and insight of the teacher. He must have a profound knowledge of his subject in order to decode its fundamental symbols and concise formulae into plain, even pedestrian English. He must localize the initial difficulty of the student, speak his language in the fullest sense of the phrase, and know when to quit laboring a point or humanizing an approach.

I believe that it is primarily in this area that a good teacher can most clearly be differentiated from the mediocre teacher. The good teacher will push the doors of his discipline wide open to the student. He will seek to explain and define its technical terminology in depth and attune its definitions to the linguistic and intellectual background of the student, without sacrificing scientific or academic values. He will in this way share the secrets of his discipline with the student and initiate him into the processes and procedures of a field of human knowledge. The inferior or mediocre teacher will simply hear the lesson, mentally collating it with the statements of the textbook. And if that is all that is done, the student will remain as much an alien to the field as before—unless, of course, he succeeds despite the teacher.

It seems to me that departmental committees on personnel might well request a candidate for appointment to restate in simple language, as if addressing a group of students, some of the basic abstractions and technical terms of his field. His ability to do so effectively in the manner I have been trying to formulate might well be one of the prerequisites for appointment. The potentialities of a teacher are likely to reveal themselves to a significant degree in the process.

V

For a score of years, many of us have been preoccupied with the last of the problems listed, that of individualizing instruction. It has been a source of concern particularly, but not exclusively, among teachers of cumulative disciplines like mathematics and language. In these subjects, each assignment usually assumes familiarity with preceding material, which individual students may have forgotten or actually may never have understood. By and large, experimentation with remedial courses has not been too successful. Such courses are conducted in groups and are therefore not designed to meet individual needs.

Can individual shortcomings such as an inability to clear fractions or to recognize the passive voice be handled in, let us say, a class in College Algebra or Nineteenth Century French Prose? It is obvious that whatever the correctives may be, they must not to any significant degree impede the progress of which the group as such is capable. A skilled teacher can most often uncover these weak spots through very few questions. If a difficulty is obviously limited to one or two members of the class, they could be given individual home assignments to cover it. One can, for instance, visualize a student in a College Algebra course submitting as a supplement to the class assignment five examples involving decimals, which the teacher would correct personally with him after the hour.

It is for each of us to decide whether procedures of this sort are worth while. They would in all probability have to be repeated many times, cover many simple topics, and involve the correction of many assignments after class, until a student who needs such attention could get his mathematical or linguistic legs. But work of this sort does provide a way to create the wholesomest of personal relations between students and a teacher who could carry it on sympathetically and patiently. And it may contribute to form more confident and therefore happier tenants of our disciplines—perhaps, in time, even creative ones.

For I believe that reading with discernment is in itself at least partially a creative process. This thought was driven home to me in one of the most unsuccessful but somehow rewarding interviews I have ever had.

About fifteen years ago, in Madrid, I visited Azorin, the outstanding Spanish stylist of our time. I was engaged at the moment in a study of some phases of Spanish synonymy. I had discovered that Mr. Azorin had consistently used the Spanish equivalent for the word "commence" in his voluminous writings and rarely, if ever, the equivalent for "begin." It seemed to me that the Spanish word for "begin" reflected the initial phase of an act or condition, which had not yet reached its normal rhythm, like the action of the motor of a car before it is thrown into high gear. "Comenzar," on the other hand, seemed to imply that something, that had not been, suddenly came into existence like a theatrical performance when the curtain rises. I believed that Mr. Azorin deliberately used the word "comenzar" because he sought to create an impression of rapid movement by stringing together short sentences which described discrete actions almost without connectives, and that "comenzar" served this purpose. I ventured a comparison of Mr. Azorin's style with some of the effects achieved by Hemingway and asked Mr. Azorin to comment on those observations. He said they interested and even intrigued him. But he refused to comment. He said that I or anyone else had as much right as he to interpret what he had written. Why should he attempt to limit the meaning of his words? Indeed, could he? His works had an objective existence of their own and said more or less than he had planned, and for many people things he had never consciously intended. He was right, of course. What would Shakespeare say about the commentary of the centuries on his works, if he were to return to earth today? Could he wipe them out, saying he had never intended anything of the sort?

As Azorin implied, discerning reading entails interpretation and therefore some personal contribution on the reader's part. It is in that sense a creative skill of a high intellectual order. I think it is no paltry question to ask: How can the Liberal Arts help students to achieve it?

FOOTBALL AND THE UNIVERSITY

By VAN CLEVE MORRIS

University of Georgia

Now that fall is here and football is with us again, it is appropriate to renew the discussion developing over recent years concerning the rôle of athletics in the ongoing programs of American colleges and universities. This essay is no bold attempt to "cut the Gordian knot" and solve the so-called "football problem," but simply a try at studying the perennial conflict from a new point of view and at making a fresh diagnosis of the trouble. The thesis of this piece is that big-time, intercollegiate athletics as now carried on and higher education as we have known it are fundamentally and basically incompatible. An attempt will be made to analyze and document this thesis and to suggest measures to aid and abet movements, already under way, which are leading to a solution.

It might be well to begin by considering the general historical context in which the problem has arisen. Though conditions are changing in higher education, it is true that the academic life has been and still is a rather unbalanced one—devoted largely to use of the mind with little concomitant exercise of the body. It is no wonder that students, particularly in an earlier day, have sought relief from their studies through activities in their leisure which would enable them to relax and dissipate the fatigue and ennui of academic work. As is well known, students have discovered that athletic activities seem to have great therapeutic value in this regard, and colleges and universities have seen over the past 50 to 100 years the steady growth of such activities on their campuses.

As these recreational activities expanded and developed and as the games played became organized and standardized, keen rivalries developed among student groups. Ability in these sports came to have a certain amount of social importance. Athletic teams developed in skill, and it was inevitable that they would seek friendly

competiti with students in other institutions. It soon became appropriate for teams representing schools to engage each other from time to time. Indeed, it was discovered that this kind of competitive, intercollegiate athletics helped immeasurably to develop among students and faculty a group loyalty or institutional *esprit*.

In recent years, college and university administrators have witnessed this phenomenon of growing "school spirit" among alumni and even the general public. And few can dispute the fact that it has been due largely to the institutional advertising provided by large and well-organized athletic programs. It is to their credit that these men have intelligently exploited this surge of public good will by tapping groups in the educational community for large sums of money with which to improve the instructional programs of their institutions. Unfortunately, however, as time has passed, the process described here has proved a boomerang. These same administrators, enamored of the workings of this mechanism in attracting large sums of money, have fallen prey to the athletic interests and have allowed, and in many cases encouraged, athletic programs to grow to great proportions. Of course, it is not to their discredit that they sought funds, for this is one of the legitimate functions of modern educational administration, and the public measures the success of an institution today largely in terms of what money can bring—buildings, large enrollments, and expanded services. The situation is regrettable rather because these college and university officials have discovered themselves fostering the growth of an enterprise which is essentially not educational but more properly classified as entertainment. In the case of football, it can be classified in many institutions today not as a function of a university in carrying out its educational responsibility but instead as a full-fledged commercial enterprise in public entertainment playing to a large and faithful clientele, and justified primarily by its value in stimulating public recognition of the institution involved.

Except for a few instances which have recently come to light, there is little that is vicious or outright wicked in the way most colleges and universities carry on their athletic competition with each other. Indeed, there is much that can be said for intercollegiate athletics and for football in particular in the modern collegiate

institution. Many young men are given, through this medium, excellent professional training in the coaching of football, a game which has seen growing popularity among participants and spectators at all ages. Moreover, a university in its football program trains many athletes for professional playing of the game itself after the close of their collegiate careers. It is, of course, true that most universities have not considered training for this profession to be one of their educational obligations, but in the modern conception of higher education in America it could be claimed as just as honorable a profession as many of those for which training programs now exist.

Nor can one overlook the very real value of making a college education available to many young men who, without help from athletic scholarships and grants-in-aid, would otherwise be denied it. These, and perhaps others, can be cited as genuine educational values accruing from present-day intercollegiate athletic programs.

II

More mature consideration, however, calls for concern not only with what is done for these young men but with what is happening *to a university* in the process. If an athletic program in an *educational* institution can be justified at all, it must be justified on *educational* grounds, and recent rumblings from the offices of college and university presidents suggest that many of them are hard put to it to find sufficient educational value in big-time athletics to continue carrying them in their programs. Of equal significance, however, is that similar rumblings are issuing from the athletic offices, and it is increasingly apparent that coaches and directors of athletics frequently find their ambitions frustrated and their energies dissipated by conflicting policies from institutional officials.

This suggests the very real possibility that the two are basically at odds, working at cross-purposes, serving different masters. An examination of each seems to confirm this view. Taking first the football enterprise, it is easily seen that it has built over the years a sports-loving clientele which enjoys watching experts play a complex and interesting game. Moreover, this clientele has demonstrated its willingness to part with considerable sums to enjoy this

type of entertainment. As time goes on, this group of patrons (and it is not quite fair to assume that it is made up mostly or even primarily of alumni) is likely to become not less but more demanding of expert, high-quality performance on the playing field.

It should be obvious to anyone that the game of football has become a part of American life, a legitimate and full-fledged segment of the whole world of commercial entertainment in sports. Because of this, its commercial nature cannot very successfully be reduced or significantly modified, and therefore whatever measures are taken must inevitably recognize the impossibility of turning back the clock and retrieving an earlier and educationally more desirable state of affairs.

For these reasons, it is doubtful whether such measures as reducing the number of grants-in-aid, eliminating spring practice, and discontinuing the scheduling of post-season (bowl) games will be of any real help. Since people—alumni, students, faculty, and the general public—want to see football played by experts and will continue to pay for it, the above measures will in all likelihood not help return this sport to its rightful place in a university program. Indeed, the “under-the-table” practices sometimes referred to in this connection would tend to increase in intensity. If grants-in-aid, for instance, were reduced to zero, professional-caliber athletes would still be recruited and matriculated in our universities and be well supported by outside treasuries. The sports-loving people of America are going to have football teams, good ones, and they are going to “foot the bill” in one way or another. While one might wish it otherwise, there seems no escape from this fundamental fact.

From all of this it may be inferred that the main business of coaches and other individuals in the athletic enterprise is to satisfy this public hunger for sports. The more spectacular they can make it, the more competitive it becomes, the higher the quality of play they can produce on the field, the greater is their success at their chosen profession. Their main business is to put on a show. This costs money, so they must charge admission. The better the show, the larger the gate. The larger the gate, the larger the profit. The larger the profit, the larger the operation becomes, until they find themselves in what we now refer to as “big-time” athlet-

ics. This is the evolution that football has followed throughout America.

The main business of universities, however, is education, a responsibility of vast proportions and intricate complexity. Universities are not in the business of entertaining people; they are maintained and supported by our society to enlighten, to educate, and to advance the state of knowledge both practical and theoretical. The necessity to entertain the general public periodically only serves to vitiate the energies which a university is devoting to the main task—the education of the community.

III

The sum and substance of our dilemma is simply that historical accident has placed together two incompatible enterprises—an institution of higher learning and a recreational and commercial form of entertainment. There is nothing wrong with the latter if it is organized and operated in its own right; indeed, our whole culture is full of such commercial forms of sports entertainment—boxing, baseball, hockey, horse racing, and many others. It just so happened that in the confusing, explosive development of higher education in a dynamic American culture, football was born, grew and prospered in an academic environment.¹

The problem, then, is not how to exorcise this Frankenstein or cut off its legs and ram it back into the Pandora's box where it belongs, but rather how to cut it loose, how to set it adrift, so that it can grow to its own rightful place in the American scheme of things. The problem, to repeat, is to discover a way in which these two enterprises, each of which has a right to unfettered growth and development but which do not belong together in one institution, can be divorced. It is this possibility that is examined below.

There are some extremists who, diagnosing the problem in this

¹ Many explanations have been given for this. The seasonal factor seems the most acceptable. Baseball, of course, is a summer game. Of games played during the school year, football comes during the fall, just after colleges and universities begin a new year. Students return with excitement and anticipation, and some of this enthusiasm is appropriately drained off in non-academic pursuits prior to the settling down to school work. Moreover, football is played outdoors in large stadiums where great numbers can be accommodated.

In the case of institutions in which the winter, indoor game of basketball has assumed substantial commercial proportions, what is said here regarding football applies to basketball as well.

way, have suggested that the divorce be of the "shot-gun" variety, *i.e.*, that the football enterprise be summarily reorganized as a professional and openly commercial one, that the teams be hired as professional teams are hired, and that they conduct their affairs independently of institutions to which they at present happen to be attached. Although it is highly unlikely that students, alumni, and the football public would accept such a proposal, from the educational standpoint it would appear preferable to what we now have.¹ If not immediately possible, certainly given time and a little Fabian patience, we might profitably embark on a program calling for the evolutionary divorce of big-time, commercial, professional athletics from higher education. How can it be done?

Fortunately, and to the surprise of many, much has been done already. For instance, athletic establishments in most large universities are even now fiscally independent of their institutions. They maintain separate budgets, and purchase equipment and pay salaries from their own funds. Where institutional financial aid is not sufficient to underwrite losses suffered in gate receipts during lean years, groups outside these universities—alumni, business interests, fans—have come to their assistance. Moreover, in most institutions, the athletic establishment has staked out its own geographical place of business—offices, buildings, practice and playing fields—which are more or less off-limits for the rest of the institution. In many cases, the athletes themselves live, eat, sleep, study and play apart from the rest of the student body. In all of these ways we can see that the much desired separation has already begun.

If they are alert to the significance of these incipient developments, university officials may therefore take heart—"history is on their side." With a little cooperation on their part, the separation here advocated may be brought off with no ill effects to either party.

IV

Keeping before us the evolutionary character of this "grand design," and thinking in terms of a period of five to ten years during

¹ It should be reiterated that educators would, of course, prefer to return to an earlier conception of sports in university life, but this appears to be an unrealizable dream for reasons outlined above.

which adjustment to one new development can be completed before moving on to the next, we might appropriately consider the following measures as suggestive of the administrative approach to be used.

First, it would seem advisable, in all matters dealing with the athletic establishment, to encourage the growing separation between it and the university in question. Fiscal and legal items of detail, such as ownership of equipment, buildings, grounds, etc., might serve as vehicles for endowing athletic departments with increasingly greater autonomy.

Second, it should become the candid policy of institutions in which the problem is most acute to encourage speakers and field representatives from the university staff to remind audiences and others with whom they come in contact of the difficulties that accrue from trying to run a university with the distraction of a football team. Perhaps the coaches and others in the athletic establishment could "work the other side of the street," and at the innumerable banquets at which football coaches are invited to speak, splendid opportunity would be provided for them to remind public and alumni groups of the difficulties in producing a winning football team within the confines of university regulations. From all indications, the general public needs and wants education of this type which will demonstrate to them clearly the basic incompatibility of these two enterprises.

Third, football players should be encouraged to separate themselves from the student body even more than they have already. Perhaps, in time it could be suggested that they be exempt from attending classes for the fall term during the active season. Later this could be made mandatory, out of a very justifiable belief that playing football is a full-time job and cannot be carried on effectively concurrently with the pursuit of collegiate studies. Some time later this same stipulation could be applied to the spring term, all of these moves having as their object the eventual separation of athletes from the regular student body. (Presumably, they would still be welcome during other terms of the school year to pursue studies like any other qualified students.)

Fourth, measures should be taken in the various regional athletic conferences and in the National Collegiate Athletic Association to

minimize the importance of, and eventually do away with, the many restrictions on the number of allowable days of practice in the spring, fall, or both; on the number of grants-in-aid; on the playing of post-season games. With the removal of these artificial restrictions, the football enterprise may grow and develop, and the more it grows the more it will tend to separate itself from college and university life.

In most institutions, the fiction of faculty rank is retained for coaches and their assistants. Perhaps a special category could be created so that they could be removed gracefully from the instructional ranks. Then at some later date their status could be changed to that of "coach" and they would be coaches, in name and fact.

In many institutions, it is claimed that the football establishment supports other sports and, in some cases, the physical education department. While this may have been true in the past, claims of approaching inflationary bankruptcy coming from coaches and athletic directors would suggest that this situation is passing. At any rate, a university should not allow itself to be maneuvered into the position of depending upon noneducational profit-making enterprises to support its program, and the suggested reorganization of major sports here suggested will necessitate the integration of other sports and physical education into the regular university program. These activities, if they are of genuine educational value, must and should compete openly with all other segments of the educational program for budgetary allotments. To repeat what was said earlier, every activity in which a university engages should be able to justify itself on the contribution it makes to the educational program and not on how much profit it can yield.

V

As the separation of football and university progresses, it might also be suggested that the alumni society be encouraged to take a more active part in supporting the athletic establishment. Perhaps eventually these societies would come to be the principal sponsors of football teams, and while the teams might retain their nicknames and the names of their institutions, it would be clearly understood that they played under the sponsorship of the alumni for purposes of raising money for alumni activities, for keeping alive

alumni spirit, and for maintaining public relations for alma mater.

If the alumni society did not care to get into the football business, then it would be possible for the football establishment to develop on its own into a legitimate commercial enterprise in public entertainment. In this event, there is little doubt that the alumni and other groups would see to it that support for the team would be forthcoming. It is even conceivable that such teams might still continue to identify themselves by their institutional names. Although there may be some objection to this, it should be pointed out that a parallel practice is customary in other professional sports. In baseball, for instance, all major league clubs identify themselves with the name of their home city. No one is thereby deceived into believing that the New York Yankees, for example, are sponsored by the City of New York. What would be more sensible than a continued use of institutional names in an emerging development of professional football?

How losing coaches would be removed and winning coaches installed is a detail properly left to the evolutionary development of this idea. We may be confident that a way will be found. Taking the plan as a whole, it would seem that the coaching staffs of our colleges and universities would find it eminently sensible. Their task would no longer be confounded by injunctions to "build character" or to develop "team spirit," but would be primarily to put on display an expert and winning performance of an intricate and complex spectator sport.

As pointed out earlier, there are many aspects of our present plight which indicate that the developing separation here outlined is already under way. Instead of assuming the attitude of "letting nature take its course," our professional sincerity obliges us to rationalize our difficulty, prescribe and carry out concrete measures for its solution, and thereby speed up the entire process.

It seems only honest to accept the fact that football is here to stay as a commercial and large-scale business, that its anti-educational demands will be met so long as it can show a profit, and that the best hope, after all, is its separation from college and university affairs.

CONCERNING INDIVIDUAL FEDERAL INCOME TAX RETURNS IN 1953

A Note to the Membership

For many years Professor J. M. Maguire of the Harvard Law School has prepared the annual article on Federal income tax returns for publication in this *Bulletin*. The publication of these articles has been one of the services of the Association to the profession. Pressure of other work has made it impossible for Professor Maguire to prepare an article this year, and the Association's Central Office was unable to obtain the services of another qualified person to prepare the current article. During the past twelve months there has been no major Federal revenue legislation. It is Professor Maguire's belief, therefore, that, as far as the making of returns in 1953 is concerned, his article of last year, "Individual Federal Income Tax in 1952," in the Winter, 1951-52 issue of this *Bulletin*, pages 735-767, will be helpful, and is free from risk of misdirection.

Comparing the return forms to be used in 1953 for 1952 income with the return forms in 1952 for 1951 income, Professor Maguire finds that the numbering of items has remained substantially constant, so that his commentary of a year ago can readily be applied to the current return forms. Schedules C and D have been revised, but inasmuch as these schedules carry their own instructions, the revision should not be confusing. Professor Maguire has not had the opportunity to study the revised instructions which will be sent to taxpayers in 1953 together with Form 1040. These instructions, he points out, undoubtedly contain new material and should be noted carefully. He points out, also, that the remarks on pages 766-767 of the 1952 tax return article concerning "Other Sources of Information" are one year out of date and are, therefore, not accurate as of the present.

Professor Maguire indicates that, in one particular respect, comments in his article of a year ago should be modified, namely, those

on pages 759-760 concerning the Tax Court case of *Chester C. Hand*. He believes that these comments are unduly apprehensive; that while the language of Judge Black's opinion in this case is, in some respects, unfortunate, the context is such as to make clear that the effect of this language should be limited to cases in which taxpayers seek to take advantage of the optional standard deduction and do not choose the alternative of itemizing their deductions on page 3 of Form 1040.

The Association's Central Office has a limited supply of offprints of Professor Maguire's article cited above. These offprints are available, upon request, to those of the Association who became members since the publication of the article and who do not have access to the issue of the Association's *Bulletin* in which the article was published. In this connection, it should be noted that many college and university libraries receive the *Bulletin* of the Association. It is suggested, therefore, that before requesting an offprint of Professor Maguire's article of a year ago, the member concerned should inquire of the library of the institution with which he is associated concerning the availability of the article.

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, *General Secretary*

REPORT OF THE 1952 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

To the Members of the Association:

The 1952 Nominating Committee of the American Association of University Professors submits herewith its nominations for membership on the Council of the Association for the three-year term 1953-55, commencing at the close of the last session of the Council held in conjunction with the next Annual Meeting of the Association. Final consideration was given these nominations in a meeting of the Committee on Saturday, September 13, 1952, in the Association's Central Office in Washington, D. C. The General Secretary, Associate Secretary, and Staff Associate of the Association were available in their offices to provide information requested by the Committee.

The response of the members of the Association in suggesting persons for consideration by the Committee provided the Committee with a total of 579 names of persons, representing 271 institutions. These suggestions had been tabulated and classified by the staff of the Association's Central Office, together with pertinent data from the Association's records, and had been circulated to the members of the Committee on August 6, well in advance of the meeting of the Committee. Additional names of persons suggested in other ways for consideration by the Committee raised the total to 689 persons whose qualifications were considered.

Attention of the members of the Association is directed to By-Law No. 1 of the Association's Constitution. This By-Law requires the Committee to select two nominees for the Council from each of ten Districts, and in so doing to give "due regard to fields of professional interest, types of institutions, and suggestions received from members." (For the text of By-Law No. 1 of the Association's Constitution, see the Spring, 1952 issue of the *Bulletin* of the Association.) Members selected for nomination

to the Council obviously should be of standing in the profession and conversant and in sympathy with the principles and purposes of the Association, and should be willing to serve the Association. The Committee has made its nominations with all these considerations in mind, and has sought to select nominees of such qualifications that regardless of who is elected, the Association will secure Council members of the highest capacities and professional ideals.

Members of the Association are also asked to note the provision in the same By-Laws of the Association's Constitution that additional nominations may be made by petition, signed in each case by not less than fifty Active Members resident within the District from which the nomination is made, with not more than ten signers from any single chapter. Such nominations by petition must be filed with the General Secretary not later than November 15. (For the detailed statement of the required procedure, see By-Law No. 1, cited above.)

The nominees presented herewith and the nominees that may be presented by petition will be voted upon by the Active Members of the Association by mail ballot early in 1953 as an extension of the Annual Meeting of the Association. The results in this, the Association's annual election, will be announced at the next Annual Meeting of the Association, to be held in Chicago, March 27 and 28, 1953.

The Committee expresses its appreciation of the cooperation of individual members and Chapters in suggesting the names of persons worthy of consideration for nomination to the Council, and also of the extensive assistance given by the staff of the Association's Central Office in tabulating detailed lists of those suggested, according to institution and District, together with pertinent data concerning each of them, a list of institutions currently or previously represented on the Council and of those never so represented, and a list of present subject matter representation on the Council and the frequency of previous subject matter representation thereon. The preparation of these summaries of information, so invaluable to the work of the Committee, obviously entailed long and painstaking work. Finally, the Committee wishes to express its appreciation of the responses of the General

Secretary, Associate Secretary, and Staff Associate to the Committee's many requests for information during its meeting on September 13.

Respectfully submitted,

Bentley Glass (Biology), The Johns Hopkins University,
Chairman

James Holladay (Economics), University of Alabama

Helen C. White (English), University of Wisconsin

Nominees for the Council, 1953-55¹

DISTRICT I

RALPH W. MCCOY, Biology, Fresno State College

Elected 1941.² Chap. Vice-Pres., 1949-50; Chap. Pres., 1950-51.

Born 1904. A.B., 1932, M.A., 1933, Ph.D., 1937, Indiana University. Teaching Assistant, 1933-37, Indiana University; Instructor, 1937-39, University of Idaho; Member of Faculty, 1939-43, State Teachers College, California, Pennsylvania; Associate Professor, 1945-46, Willamette University; Assistant Professor, 1946-47, Associate Professor, 1947-50, Professor, 1950- , Fresno State College.

DOROTHY C. SCHILLING, English, Arizona State College (Tempe)

Elected 1946.

Born 1897. A.B., 1921, A.M., 1925, Ph.D., 1926, Stanford University. Instructor, 1926-28, Kern Junior College; Instructor, 1928-32, Humboldt State College; Associate Professor, 1932-33, Professor, 1933- , Arizona State College (Tempe).

DISTRICT II

LEO FRIEDMAN, Chemistry, Oregon State College

Elected 1930. Chm., Chap. Committee on Salaries, 1944-45, 1947-48, Mbr., 1949-52; Chap. Pres., 1945-47; Mbr., Chap. Committee on Membership, 1951-52; Chm., Oregon Council of Association Chapters, 1952-53; Pres., Oregon State System Federation of Association Chapters, 1952- .

¹ Ten members to be elected, one from each of the geographical districts.

² Refers in this and each following statement to the date of election to Association membership.

Born 1902. B.S., 1925, University of Maine; Ph.D., 1928, University of Wisconsin. Instructor, 1928-29, Assistant Professor, 1929-32, University of Oregon; Assistant Professor, 1932-43, Associate Professor, 1943-45, Professor, 1945-Oregon State College.

RALPH IRA THAYER, Economics, State College of Washington

Elected 1946. Chm., Chap. Committee on Annuities and Pensions, 1946-47, University of Washington; Chap. Vice-Pres., 1951, Chap. Pres., 1951-52, State College of Washington.

Born 1915. B.S., 1937, Northwestern University; M.A., 1944, University of Washington; Ph.D., 1947, Stanford University. Investment Analyst, 1937-40, Bankers Life Company; Teaching Assistant, 1940-42, Assistant Professor, 1945-48, Assistant Director, Institute of Labor Economics, 1947-48, University of Washington; Associate Professor, 1948-51, Professor, 1951-, State College of Washington.

DISTRICT III

THOMAS C. GEARY, Political Science, University of South Dakota

Elected 1939. Chap. Vice-Pres., 1949-50; Chap. Pres., 1950-52.

Born 1912. B.A., 1933, Columbia College (Iowa); M.A., 1934, Ph.D., 1937, State University of Iowa. Assistant Professor, 1937-42, Associate Professor, 1942-43, Professor, 1946-, University of South Dakota; Ensign, 1943-44, Lt.(j.g.), 1944-46, Lt., 1946, U.S. Naval Reserve.

JOHN S. PENN, Speech, University of North Dakota

Elected 1947. Chm., Chap. Committee on Administrative Reorganization, 1947-48; Chap. Salary Committee, 1951-52; Chap. Treas., 1950-51, Chap. Vice-Pres., 1951-52, Chap. Pres., 1952-53, Chap. Executive Committee, 1950-53.

Born 1914. B.A., 1935, Carroll College; M.A., 1938, cand. Ph.D., University of Wisconsin. Teacher, 1936-38, Senior High School, Baraboo, Wisconsin; Head, Speech Department, 1938-40, Senior High School, Muskegon, Michigan; Assistant Professor, 1940-47, Associate Professor, 1947-, Head of Department, 1948-, University of North Dakota; Ensign, 1943-44, Lt. (j.g.), 1944-46, U.S. Navy.

DISTRICT IV

JAMES C. CAREY, History, Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science

Elected 1949. Chap. Executive Committee, 1950; Chap. Committee on Responsibilities and Rights of Faculty Members, 1950; Chap. Pres., 1951-52.

Born 1915. B.A., 1937, Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne); M.A., 1940, Ph.D., 1948, University of Colorado; Certificado, 1943, Universidad de San Marcos. Director, 1941-45, Colegio America del Callao, Peru; Director, 1945, Public Library, City of Callao, Peru; Instructor, 1946, 1947, University of Colorado; Assistant Professor, 1948-50, Associate Professor, 1950- , Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science.

WILLIAM CHARLES KORFMACHER, Classical Languages, St. Louis University

Elected 1935. Chap. Sec., 1935-38; Chap. Pres., 1938-40.

Born 1900. A.B., 1922, A.M., 1923, St. Louis University; Ph.D., 1934, University of Chicago. Instructor, 1925-34, Assistant Professor, 1934-39, Associate Professor, 1939-45, Professor, 1945- , Director of Department, 1944- , St. Louis University.

DISTRICT V

DAVIS P. RICHARDSON, Mathematics, University of Arkansas

Elected 1929. Chap. Committee on Tenure, 1948-50; Chap. Sec., 1930-31; Chap. Pres., 1951-52.

Born 1902. B.A., 1922, University of Arkansas; A.M., 1927, Harvard University; Ph.D., 1930, University of Chicago. Instructor, 1924-26, Georgia School of Technology; Instructor, 1927-30, Assistant Professor, 1930-37, Associate Professor, 1937-47, Professor, 1947- , Chairman of Department, 1949- , University of Arkansas; Captain, 1941-43, Major, 1943-46, Lieutenant Colonel, 1946, U.S. Army.

JOSIAH C. RUSSELL, History, University of New Mexico

Elected 1947. Chap. Pres., 1950-52.

Born 1900. A.B., 1922, Earlham College; attended University of Rome, Italy, 1920-21; M.A., 1923, Ph.D., 1926, Harvard University. Assistant, 1923-24, Radcliffe College; Assistant, 1924-26, Harvard University; Assistant Professor, 1927-29, Colorado College; Professor and Head of Social Science, 1929-31, New Mexico Highlands University; Instructor, 1931-35, Assistant Professor, 1935-39, Associate Professor, 1939-46, University of North Carolina; Professor and Head of Department, 1946- , University of New Mexico; Visiting Professor (Fulbright Award), 1952-53, University of Wales.

DISTRICT VI

WILLIAM F. EDGERTON, Egyptology, University of Chicago

Elected 1930. Chap. Sec., 1936-38; Chap. Pres., 1940-41; Chm., Nominating Committee, 1939.

Born 1893. A.B., 1915, Cornell University; Ph.D., 1922, University of Chicago. Private, Pfc., Corporal, Sergeant, 1918-19, U.S. Army (Medical Department); Assistant, 1922-23, Epigrapher, 1926-29, Associate Professor, 1929-37, Professor, 1937- , Chairman of Department, 1948- , University of Chicago; Captain, 1942-43, Major, 1943-45, U.S. Army (Signal Corps); Fulbright Research Scholar, 1951-52, University of Cambridge.

HAROLD W. HANNAH, Agricultural Law, University of Illinois

Elected 1950. Chap. Pres., 1950-51; Chm., Chap. Committee on Intellectual Freedom, 1951-52.

Born 1911. B.S., 1932, LL.B., 1935, University of Illinois. Assistant, 1935, 1937, Assistant Professor, 1941-45, Associate Professor, 1945-49, Director, Special Service, War Veterans, 1945-47, Professor, 1949- , University of Illinois; First Lieutenant, 1941-42, Captain, 1942-43, Major, 1943-44, Lieutenant Colonel, 1944, U.S. Army (Inf., Parachute Inf., and GSC).

DISTRICT VII

MARCUS WHITMAN, Economics, University of Alabama

Elected 1931. Chap. Sec., 1934-37; Chap. Pres., 1946-48; Chap. Council, 1948- .

Born 1902. B.A., 1924, M.A., 1925, Ph.D., 1932, University of Wisconsin. Assistant Instructor, 1925-27, University of Wisconsin; Assistant Professor, 1927-28, Associate Professor, 1928-37, Professor, 1937- , University of Alabama.

WALDEMAR T. ZIEGLER, Chemical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology

Elected 1944. Chap. Pres., 1950-51.

Born 1910. B.S., 1932, Georgia Institute of Technology; M.S., 1933, Emory University; Ph.D., 1938, Johns Hopkins University. Assistant, 1932-35, Emory University; Assistant, 1935-38, Instructor, 1938-42, Associate, 1942-44, Johns Hopkins University; Research Chemist, 1944-46, Columbia University (Manhattan Project); Research Associate Professor, 1946-48, Research Professor, 1948- , Georgia Institute of Technology.

DISTRICT VIII

DOUGLAS B. MAGGS, Constitutional Law, Duke University

Elected 1933. Chap. Vice-Pres., 1936.

Born 1899. A.B., 1922, J.D., 1924, University of California; S.J.D., 1926, Harvard University. Assistant Professor (and Editor-in-Chief, California Law Review), 1926-27, University of California; Professor (and Editor-in-Chief, 1927-28, Southern California Law Review), 1927-30, University of Southern California; Visiting Professor, 1928-29, Columbia University; Professor, 1930- , Duke University; Visiting Professor, spring semester, 1936, Yale University; Special Assistant to the Attorney General, 1938-39, 1942-43; Chief of Wage-Hour Unit, Department of Justice, 1939; Chief Legal Consultant, Office for Emergency Management, 1942-43; Solicitor, Department of Labor, 1943-45. Chm., Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Association of American Law Schools, 1949-52.

ELINOR PANCOAST, Economics, Goucher College

Elected 1929. Chap. Sec., 1947-48; Chap. Pres., 1948-49; Chm., Chap. Committee on Retirement, 1951-53.

Born 1893. Attended University of Texas, 1911-13; Ph.B., 1917, M.A., 1922, Ph.D., 1927, University of Chicago; attended Bryn Mawr College, 1918-19; Teacher, 1918-19, High School, Wichita Falls, Texas; Instructor, 1924-25, Assistant Professor, 1925-30, Associate Professor, 1930-35, Acting Dean, 1930-31, Professor and Chairman of Department, 1935- , Goucher College.

DISTRICT IX

JOHN P. ROCHE, Political Science, Haverford College

Elected 1950. Chap. Sec., 1950-52.

Born 1923. A.B., 1943, Hofstra College; A.M., 1947, Ph.D., 1949, Cornell University. Assistant, 1947-49, Cornell University; Instructor, 1949-50, Assistant Professor, 1950- , Haverford College; U.S. Army (Private, Corporal, Sergeant), 1943-46.

WILLIAM LONSDALE TAYLER, Political Science, Dickinson College

Elected 1941. Chap. Pres., 1952-53.

Born 1899. B.A., 1927, University of Texas; M.A., 1928, American University; A.M., 1929, Ph.D., 1935, Columbia University; Certificate, 1931, Institut Universitaire de Hautes Etudes Internationales (Geneva, Switzerland); Diploma, 1948, Inter-American Academy of Comparative and International Law (Havana,

Cuba). High School Principal, 1923-25, Bureau of Education, Philippine Islands; Instructor, 1927-28, American University; Instructor, 1928-30, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn; Instructor, 1936-38, New York University; Assistant Professor, 1938-40, Queens College (N.Y.); Associate Professor, 1940-41, Berea College; Assistant Professor and Director of Inter-American Demonstration Center, 1941-42, Syracuse University; Historian, 1942-43, Board of Economic Warfare; Chief, Records Analysis Division, 1943-45, Foreign Economic Administration; Chief, Records Analysis Division, 1945-46, U.S. Department of State; Professor and Chairman of Department, 1947- , Dickinson College; Dean, 1950-52, Overseas Branches, American International College (U.S. Air Force Colleges) in Saudi Arabia, the Azores and Bermuda.

DISTRICT X

MARY L. COOLIDGE, Philosophy, Wellesley College

Elected 1941. Chap. Pres., 1950-52.

Born 1891. B.A., 1914, Bryn Mawr College; Ed.M., 1926, Harvard Graduate School of Education; M.A., 1927, Ph.D., 1930, Radcliffe College. Elementary teacher, 1915-17, Miss Park's School; Warden, 1922-24, Bryn Mawr College; Instructor, 1929-30, Assistant Professor, 1930-31, Vassar College; Dean and Associate Professor, 1931-37, Professor, 1937- , Wellesley College.

H. B. KIRSHEN, Economics, University of Maine

Elected 1938. Chap. Pres., 1949-51.

Born 1903. B.S., 1926, Whitman College; attended Columbia University Law School, 1926-28; M.A., 1929, Columbia University; Ph.D., 1937, University of Wisconsin. Instructor, 1927-29, College of the City of New York; Assistant Professor, 1926-36, Professor and Head of Department, 1937- , University of Maine; Visiting Professor, spring 1952, University of Wisconsin.

Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, the American Library Association (with adaptations for librarians), the American Political Science Association, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the Department of Higher Education of the National Education Association.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty but specifically upon its present administration. The term "administration" includes the administrative officers and the governing board of the institution. This censure does not affect the eligibility of nonmembers for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the date of censuring are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations.

West Chester State Teachers College West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	December, 1939
University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri (October, 1941, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)	December, 1941
State Teachers College, ¹ Murfreesboro, Tennessee (December, 1942, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 662-667)	May, 1943
Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina (April, 1942, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 173-176)	May, 1943
University of Texas, Austin, Texas (Winter, 1944, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 627-634; Autumn, 1945, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 462-465; Summer, 1946, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 374-385)	June, 1946
Evansville College, Evansville, Indiana (Spring, 1949, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 74-111)	March, 1950

¹ Now Middle Tennessee State College.

MEMBERSHIP

CLASSES AND CONDITIONS—NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership in the Association is by the Committee on Admission of Members upon nomination by one Active Member. Election takes place thirty days after the name of the nominee has been published in the *Bulletin*. The membership year in the Association is the calendar year (January 1 through December 31). The membership of nominees whose nominations are received before July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the current year. The membership of nominees whose nominations are received after July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the following year unless the nominee requests that his membership become effective as of January 1 of the current year.

The classes and conditions of membership are as follows:

Active. A person is eligible for election to Active membership if he holds a position of teaching and/or research, with the rank of instructor or its equivalent or higher, in an institution on the Association's eligible list, provided his work consists of at least half-time teaching and/or research. Annual dues are \$5.00.

Junior. Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions and who are not eligible for Active membership. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00.

Associate. Associate membership is not an elective membership. Active and Junior Members whose work becomes primarily

administrative are transferred to Associate membership. Annual dues are \$3.00.

Emeritus. Any member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred to Emeritus membership. Emeritus Members are exempt from dues. They may continue to receive the *Bulletin* at a special rate of \$1.00 a year.

Continuing Eligibility. Change of occupation or transfer to an institution not on the Association's eligible list does not affect eligibility for continuance of membership.

Interruption or Termination of Membership. Interruption or termination of membership requires notification to the Association's Washington office. In the absence of such notice, membership continues with receipt of the *Bulletin* for one calendar year, during which time there is an obligation to pay dues.

Nominations for Membership

The following 1048 nominations for Active membership and 36 nominations for Junior membership are published as provided in the Constitution of the Association. Protests of nominations may be addressed to the General Secretary of the Association who will, in turn, transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee on Admission of Members questions concerning the technical eligibility of nominees for membership as provided in the Constitution of the Association. To be considered, such protests must be filed with the General Secretary within thirty days after this publication.

Active

Adelphi College, Clifford R. Cave, James B. Wilbur, William M. Wynkoop; **University of Akron**, Darrel E. Witters; **Alabama Polytechnic Institute**, Cleveland L. Adams, Urban L. Diener, Thomas W. Gandy, Thomas F. Goldcamp, James H. Grisham, Robert W. Heck, A. J. Hill, Claude B. Layfield, Jr., Lee D. McChesney, William L. Miller, Richard E. Morris, Frances Norton, Thomas S. Patterson, John E. Pitts, John A. Pond, Charles W. Reynolds, A. Jude Robinson, T. Hayden Rogers, Wimberly C. Royster, A. Dewey Sanders, John L. Scarborough, William S. Smith, John L. Snare, Hsien-Chung Wang, Henry S. Ward, Jr.; **University of Alabama**, Elizabeth S. Carmichael, Elizabeth Cathey, Margaret A. Coleman, John C. Galloway, Sarah H. Glass, Lawrence Haworth, Joseph H. Hornback, Virginia W. James, Anna H. Little, Frank E.

Oakes, George E. Passey, Paul J. Piccard, Paul H. Rigby, Wiley J. Williams, Fred C. Williamson, Kenda C. Wise, Prince B. Woodard; **Albright College**, Edith B. Douds, Josephine E. Raeppl, Anna H. Smith; **Alfred University**, Daniel B. Sass; **Allegheny College**, Orval T. Driggs, Jr., Christopher Katope, Wayne R. Merrick, David J. Rogers, Taffee Tanimoto; **Allen University**, Joseph Henry, Robert E. Moran, Odessa S. Nelson; **Amherst College**, Arnold Arons, Denton W. Crocker, William B. Whiteside; **Appalachian State Teachers College**, Roscoe J. Allen; **University of Arizona**, Robert N. Burress, Lauren W. Casaday, Carl W. Cooper, Paul J. Danielson, Samuel S. Fain, R. A. Gomez, Robert M. Hammond, William F. Irmscher, Evelyn Jensen, H. Christian Kiefer, Catherine S. Kocher, Kemper W. Merriam, Marguerite E. Ough, Patricia L. Popp, Donald L. Smith; **University of Arkansas**, Joe W. Fleming, Charles H. Hendershott, Jr., Floyd D. Miner, William D. Wylie; **University of Arkansas (Medical School)**, William G. Reese; **Armstrong College**, Crawford G. Jackson, Jr.; **Army Language School**, Vladimir Bichkovski, Milan Daskaloff, Donscho Gerganow, Dmitry F. Grigorieff, Marie T. Hnyková, Leo Hulanicki, Jaroslav Husek, Claudia F. Jaryna, Janusz Kodrebski, Branko Milinovich, Marijana Mirkovic, Tatiana Nessin, Lev V. Serdakovsky, Abbas P. Seymour, George A. Shirokow, George Skariatina, Marko Vassilev, Bogdan Velizarov, Zygmunt Wasowski; **Augustana College (South Dakota)**, J. Earl Lee.

Baldwin-Wallace College, Marvin Becker, William E. Harrington, James R. Lerch, Robert W. Pitcher; **Bard College**, Irma Brandeis, William Frauenfelder; **Bates College**, Raymond W. Aiken, L. Ross Cummins, Leslie S. Forster, Bob R. Holdren; **Bennington College**, Joseph Adelson, Robert Alvin, Lucien M. Hanks, Jr., John C. Smith; **Blackburn College**, Lois Franklin, Charles A. Gray, Lois M. Hutchings, Charles B. O'Hare, Harriet Stoddard, William W. Swift; **Boston University**, Edward N. Burke, Barbara C. Hall; **Bowdoin College**, Joseph S. Van Why; **Bowling Green State University**, Frank C. Arnold, Russell Decker, Raymond W. Derr, Dorothy L. Forna, Alice Greiner, Melvin Hyman, Donald C. Kleckner, Leonard E. Olson, Warren J. Pelton, William F. Schmeltz; **Bradley University**, G. Katherine Watson; **Brigham Young University**, Don. L. Earl; **University of British Columbia**, Jacob Biely, James W. Harvey; **Brooklyn College**, Gladys H. Watson, Arthur G. Wirth; **Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn**, Ephraim Banks, Joseph L. Weininger; **Bryn Mawr College**, Eugene V. Schneider; **Bucknell University**, Frank A. Hoffmann, Ruth M. Lavare, Janus Poppe, John S. Wheatcroft, Bennett R. Willeford, Jr.; **Butler University**, Hattie Lundgren.

California Institute of Technology, Hans W. Liepmann; **University of California (Davis)**, Arthur L. Black, Linda Van Norden; **University of California (Los Angeles)**, Herman F. Schott, Joseph Sheehan; **Carleton College**, Cyrus C. DeCoster, Sumner C. Hayward, Harry W. Osborne; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, Alexander Henderson, Richard Levitan; **Carroll College (Wisconsin)**, Einar J. Eilertson, Lewis E. Whitehart; **Carthage College**, Samuel E. Brick, Wayne E. Brockriede, Robert L. Hade, Margaret Heinsen, William Joseph, Roy G. Julow, James H. McAllister; **Catholic University of**

America, Raymond Moller, John H. Palacios; **Central College (Iowa)**, Arthur B. Conner, Thomas A. Israel, Thomas Van Dahm; **Central College (Missouri)**, David F. Parten; **Chicago Teachers College**, Pearl B. Drubeck, David H. Heller, Janet R. Young; **University of Chicago**, Sidney J. Socolar; **Chico State College**, Katharine W. Dresden, William McCann, Fred R. Neumann; **University of Cincinnati**, James R. Bryner, Ruth I. Smith, Charles E. Stevenson, Richard L. Strecker; **The City College**, Frank C. Davidson, Arthur H. Des-Grey, George R. Keane, James R. McDermott, Jr., Esther G. Shefrin, Emily A. Spickler, G. Kenneth Wiggins; **Colby College**, Richard Cary; **Colorado Woman's College**, Walker S. Edwards; **University of Colorado**, John Chronic, Katherine J. Kelly, Frederick A. Rohrman, Maurice Smith; **Columbia University**, Lawrence A. Cremin, Mary Henderson, Elman R. Service; **University of Connecticut**, Mildred B. Smith; **East Contra Costa Junior College**, David A. Glover; **Cornell College**, James S. Craiger, Jr., Kenneth L. Pace; **Cornell University**, Robert L. Aronson, Robert Raimon.

Dartmouth College, Jack E. Walters; **Delaware State College**, Kelsie G. Keays, Jr.; **Delta State Teachers College**, William A. Hoppe; **Denison University**, John S. Atlee; **De Paul University**, Bernard J. Feeney, Florence Finette, Dalma M. Hunyadi, Cecilia M. Perrodin, John P. Rowan, Melvin F. Wingersky; **DePauw University**, Ralph F. Carl, Raymond E. Mizer, Doris J. O'Donnell, Charles E. Platt, John A. Ricketts, Robert J. Stebbins, Edward K. Williams; **Dickinson College**, Edgar M. Finck, Warren J. Gates, Donald T. Graffam; **Dillard University**, Robert L. Abbey, Terry M. Brookins, John A. Davis, David Denny, Austin F. Kilian, Betty Jo Kilian, Harold W. Lucien, Forrest L. McKennon, Rita E. Miller, Jesse L. Parks, Jr., Violet K. Richards, Robert Saam, Irwin Swerdlow, Joseph T. Taylor, Albert B. Wood; **Drake University**, Walter L. Brackett, Irwin Mahler, Donald H. Stewart, Charles B. Tupper; **University of Dubuque**, Bert Crocker.

East Carolina College, Donald M. Murray; **Evansville College**, Wilberta D. Edgington, Orville J. Jaebker, Gordon H. Rettke, Marquis F. Stigers.

Fayetteville State Teachers College, Rudolph Jones; **Ferris Institute (College of Pharmacy)**, George H. Wells; **Fisk University**, Inez Adams; **Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Emmett W. Bashful, Robert S. Cobb, George E. Covington, Colonius S. Davis, Ernest D. Fears, Pollie W. Fears, H. Samuel Hill, Mary B. Johnson, Julia G. Lewis, Charles U. Smith, Leonard J. Young; **Florida State University**, Stephen S. Winters; **University of Florida**, Leslie H. Charles, Svend T. Gormsen, John F. Jones, Jr., Thomas O. Neff; **Fordham University (Manhattan)**, Christian Oehler; **Fort Hays Kansas State College**, James S. Ballinger, Joel C. Moss; **Franklin College of Indiana**, Gerhard W. Dietz, Frederick Stimson; **Franklin and Marshall College**, T. Donald Rucker, Wilbur D. Shenk, John H. Vanderzell, Sidney Wise; **Fresno State College**, Robert A. Carr, William M. Parker; **Furman University**, William R. Hatchett.

George Pepperdine College, George W. Campbell, Jr., Mary K. Philips; **George Washington University**, Willard E. Caldwell, Bernard H. Fox, Philip I.

Herzbrun, L. Poe Leggette; **University of Georgia**, Theodore E. Nichols, Ila Rooks; **University of Georgia (Atlanta)**, LeJeune P. Bradley.

Hampton Institute, Robert M. Frumkin; **Hanover College**, Ronald L. Austin, Alvin K. Bailey, Leslie Eisan; **Harvard University**, Juan A. L. Marichal, Arnold M. Soloway; **Haverford College**, John A. Lester, Jr.; **Heidelberg College**, Roger L. Shinn; **Hershey Junior College**, Hiram J. Frysinger, Henry Glade, William Landis, John C. Lanz, William L. F. Schmehl, Norman Vanderwall; **Hobart and William Smith Colleges**, Norman T. Harrington, Renée A. Stevens, Evelyn Talvitie; **Hofstra College**, Pat Ancell, Georgia Lightfoot; **Hood College**, Catherine H. Foland, Leon E. Trachtman, Anne Ward; **University of Houston**, Mary L. Davis, Richard I. Evans, William R. Roberts, Jr. John Schwarzwald; **Hunter College**, Claire H. Favreau, Kathleen K. Guinee, Naomi C. Spielvogel.

University of Idaho, Ruth Anderson, Ellis T. Austin, Helen E. Dudley, John Fulton, Mark Gurevitch, James V. Jordan, Richard G. Kappler, Dwight L. Kindschy, Robert L. Peters, Maurice A. Unger, Milton A. Voigt; **Illinois Institute of Technology**, David Meiselman; **Southern Illinois University**, Harry Dewey, Milton Edelman, Howard S. Gordman, Chalmer A. Gross, F. Earle Lyman, Dorothy A. McGinniss, Marian E. Ridgeway; **University of Illinois**, Myron K. Brakke, Gwynne B. Evans, Eugene A. Holtman, John E. Pearson, Kathryn Weesner, Seymour S. Weiner; **University of Illinois (Navy Pier)**, Theodore Dolan, Robert L. Miller, J. Wesley Sanderson, Frederick O. Waller; **Indiana State Teachers College**, Agnes C. Dodds, J. Lee Guernsey, Edward A. Tenney; **Indiana University**, Mildred Adams, Otis J. Benepe, Beryl Blain, James P. Egan, Smith Higgins, Jr., John B. Irwin, Albert Lazan, John A. Moldstad, John H. Persell, Helen M. Thumm, George J. Vuke, Lorene M. Warwick; **Iowa State College**, John Gurland, George W. Peglar, Richard Phillips, J. Neil Raudabaugh, Robert L. Sinsheimer; **Iowa State Teachers College**, Manford A. Sonstegard; **State University of Iowa**, Carlton D. Schrader; **Iowa Wesleyan College**, James H. Clay.

Jersey City Junior College, Frances L. Wilson; **Johnson C. Smith University**, Winson R. Coleman, Byrd D. Crudup, Lloyd H. Davis, Foster T. Drakeford, Vietta E. Neal, Algernon O. Steele, Edwin Thompkins, Elise E. Woodard.

Kansas State College, Russell Laman; **University of Kansas**, Richard M. Mikulski; **Kent State University**, George H. Cooke, Marian J. Darst, Allan Dickie, Jerald E. Elliott, Harris Giffen, Louis K. Harris, Chong-Rwen Kao, Doris B. Kinneman, Edwin L. Lively, Blanche C. Miller, James K. Olsen, William Schock, F. Geneva Travis, Leon I. Twarog, Kenneth L. Warren, Louise H. Wheeler; **University of Kentucky**, Dougald McD. Monroe, Jr.; **Kenyon College**, Wilfred Desen, Harold W. Manner, James M. Pappenhagen, Alfred B. Starratt, Peter Taylor, Willard R. Yates; **Keuka College**, Irene Monahan; **Knoxville College**, Daphne N. Lawson, William H. McArthur, Preston N. Williams.

Lake Forest College, Henry B. Loess, Franz Schulze, Arnold R. Thomas, Patricia L. Wells; **Lamar State College of Technology**, Gus A. Carlsen; **Langston University**, Arthur C. Shropshire; **La Salle College**, Ugo Donini, Paul

Hsiang, E. Russell Naughton; **Lehigh University**, Samuel Schecter; **Lincoln University** (Pennsylvania), Manuel Rivero; **Lindenwood College**, Rosetta Palmer, Dorothy Ann Williams; **Livingstone College**, Elbert L. Harris, Albert T. James; **Los Angeles State College**, Edward T. Price, Jr.; **Northwestern State College of Louisiana**, Eola P. Rooks, Mattie T. Woodward; **Louisiana State University**, Richard R. Rebert; **Lowell Textile Institute**, Stuart L. Mandell; **Loyola University** (Illinois), Helen C. Gentile; **Iycoming College**, Doris Teno.

Manhattan College, Theodore Brenson, Vito M. Cifichiello; **Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart**, Katharine Hargrove; **Marquette University**, William A. D. Anderson, William N. Bergstrom, Lew Cunningham, Edmundo García-Girón, Joseph L. E. P. Gauthier, Hermann Karl, Charles W. Miller, John P. O'Brien, Raymond H. Reis, Manfred Stumpf, Joseph V. Talacko, Nick J. Topetz, John Treacy, F. Bernard Ward, Le Roy A. Wauck; **Marshall College**, Robert E. Nunley; **Western Maryland College**, Jean Kerschner; **University of Maryland**, John Autian, Thomas W. Hall, Robert E. McCafferty, Benjamin H. Massey, Emily S. Scott; **Massachusetts State Teachers College** (Fitchburg), Edwin R. Clark, Marion B. Cushman, John R. Eichorn, Elizabeth M. Haskins, Richard L. Kent, Philip C. McMurray, Margaret A. Shea, Ralph L. Small; **University of Massachusetts**, John G. Martin; **Memphis State College**, Leon W. Brownlee, Myrtle Cobb, Earl Crader, Enoch L. Mitchell; **Mercy College**, Mary V. Walker; **Miami University**, Jeanne Bassett, Rosamond P. Benson, Carl C. Crell, D. L. Heinemeyer, Mildred M. More, Margaret E. Phillips, Joseph C. Pillion, M. Katherine Price; **Central Michigan College of Education**, Victor Coutant, Margaret S. Millar; **Michigan State College**, James G. Carter, Joseph A. Del Porto, J. Oliver Hall, Olen E. Leonard, Herbert S. Livingston, David Loshak, Paul V. Love, Marvin D. Solomon, John M. Ward; **University of Michigan**, John P. Dunnett, Robert S. Fox, Paul Hunsicker, Ernest N. McCarus, William R. Mann, Marcus L. Plant, Marie Tolstoy; **Millsaps College**, Nancy B. Holloway, Edward M. Steel, Jr.; **Milwaukee-Downer College**, Helen I. Henry; **Miner Teachers College**, Matthew J. Whitehead; **Minnesota State Teachers College** (Bemidji), Fulton Catlin; **Minnesota State Teachers College** (Moorhead), Frances H. Dillon; **University of Minnesota**, Herbert M. Bosch, Otto E. Domian, Eloise M. Jaeger, Harold Mooney, Walter H. Uphoff; **Mississippi Southern College**, Charles E. Ambrose, William G. Burks, Joseph M. Ernest, Jr., Lawrence V. Fisher, John M. Frazier, John E. Gonzales, Joseph A. Greene, Jr., Clifford H. Hagenson, Harold L. Leone, Sr., Walter J. Lok, Rosewell G. Lowrey, Raymond Mannoni, Leo C. Muller, John F. Nau, R. Henry O'Bannon, Ida M. Pieratt, Erwin L. Preuss, Harry A. Ross, William M. Sanders, O. C. Steede; **University of Mississippi**, Fred C. Ford, Robert L. Gale, Rudolf M. Schuster, August W. Scrivner, Clarence H. Shockley, John L. Voigt; **Northwest Missouri State College**, Louise Johnson, Esther F. Knittl, Leonard Levy, Wilma Wade; **Southeast Missouri State College**, Dorothy C. Dickson, Russell J. Michel, Ralph J. Pink, Margaret M. Strahlmann; **Northeast Missouri State Teachers College**, Howard E. Thompson; **University of Missouri**, Kenneth B.

Brown, Jean Huston; **Monmouth Junior College**, Kenneth Knapp; **Monterey Peninsula College**, August Armanasco, Arla De Hart, Melvin Huden, E. Warren Seibel; **Monticello College**, Betty D. Myers; **Morehead State College**, Helen A. Greim, Marie E. Johnson, John H. Long, James R. McConkey, Guy S. Miles; **Mount Holyoke College**, Mary O. Pottenger; **Murray State College**, Walter E. Blackburn.

Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne), Benjamin B. Bernstein; **University of Nebraska**, Ann L. Hatch, Clayton P. Libeau, Irving Simos; **University of New Hampshire**, Eileen Curran, Edmund G. Miller, Henry G. Rice; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Newark)**, Donald R. Raichle; **Eastern New Mexico University**, Thelma Reed; **University of New Mexico**, Grace L. Elser, Morton J. Keston, Allan R. Richards, Edward G. Riggs II; **New York State Agricultural and Technical Institute (Alfred)**, Warren Bouck, Charles W. Cameron, Kenneth J. Hager, Samuel E. Hornbeck, Robert J. Kessler, George R. Morgenfeld, Roger F. Rawe; **New York State Teachers College (Brockport)**, Gordon F. Allen, Lynn E. Brown, Jr., Armand F. Burke, Francis G. Claffey, Barbara J. Gill, Arthur M. Lee, Charles F. Miskell, Emanuel N. Mouganis, Samuel R. Solomon, Eric M. Steel, Robert M. Thomas, Shirley M. Thomas; **New York State Teachers College (New Paltz)**, George W. Bond, Vera R. Irwin, Alfred B. Rollins, Jr., Harold E. Tannenbaum; **New York State Teachers College (Oneonta)**, Leah A. Hancock, Hannah G. Yaeger; **New York University**, Isidor Chein, Ernesto G. Da Cal, Morton Deutsch, S. Carlton Dickerman, John C. Duff, James N. Farr, Henry M. Hellman, Marie Jahoda, Philip Lichtenberg, Julius London, Kurt Mislow, James N. Sarmousakis, A. Langley Searles; **Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina**, George V. Guy; **North Carolina College at Durham**, Willia W. Lewis; **University of North Carolina**, Katherine K. Carmichael, Rashi Fein, Federico G. Gil, Ralph W. Pfouts, Sarah R. Reed, Charles N. Reilley, J. R. Skretting, Donald G. Tarbet; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Eugene C. Bovee; **North Dakota State Teachers College (Valley City)**, William B. Richter; **University of North Dakota**, Harold Brody, Robert G. Fischer, W. W. Hill, Jr., Lloyd H. King, Yukie H. Tsumagari; **Northern State Teachers College**, Paul J. Seymour; **Northwestern State College**, Kenneth A. Fite; **Northwestern University**, Arthur B. Bronwell, Jack R. Childress; **Norwich University**, Paul C. Pelton; **University of Notre Dame**, Stanislaw Kownacki, Arthur W. Phillips.

Ohio State University, Don L. Demorest, John J. O'Neill; **Ohio University**, Bernice A. Allen, Paul H. Black, William R. Brophy, Ernest M. Collins, Harry B. Crewson, Jr., Gilford Crowell, Margaret J. Felsinger, A. Lincoln Fisch, Eugene Jennings, A. Sidney Knowles, Jr., Christopher Lane, David Levinson, J. Daniel Logan, Frederick H. McKelvey, George K. Park, Roger Quisenberry, Charles A. Randall, Jr., Henri Seibert, Betty M. Weaver, Clarence H. White; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, Richard L. Burdick, Randolph K. Fusselman, Jeannette E. Stanton; **University of Oklahoma**, Lillian Castner, Garnette L. Pittro, Vivian A. Frazier, Thelma Haddan, Myrl G. Herman, Lloyd P. Jorgenson, Willard R. Lane, Harry M. Lyle, Bozidar Muntyan, Gail Shannon; **Uni-**

versity of Omaha, Robert Harwick; Oregon College of Education, H. Kent Farley, Dwight A. Lee, Lucille N. Millsap; Eastern Oregon College of Education, Richard G. Hiatt, Donald K. Nelson; Southern Oregon College of Education, Robert L. Edwards, Myrtle Funkhouser, Donald A. MacDougall, Phyllis Plichta, Elinor C. Saltus, Floyd L. Taylor; Oregon State System of Higher Education (General Extension Service), D. Howard Backlund, Jean P. Black, William H. Buell, John O. Dart, Brock Dixon, Richard B. Halley, C. Van Henkle, George C. Hoffmann, Jr., Joseph V. Holland, Emerson E. Hoogstraal, Clara C. Pierson, Philip C. Roberti, Charles M. White, Paul H. Yearout; University of Oregon, Marie Flack, Marguerite Fukami, Harold G. Richter; Ottawa University (Kansas), Rexer Berndt.

Pace College, Frederick J. Haller; Pennsylvania State College, Jacob J. Stein; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Indiana), M. Florence Wallace, Blanche Waugaman; University of Pennsylvania, Raymond S. Berkowitz, Theresa I. Lynch; University of the Philippines, Dominador I. Ilio; University of Pittsburgh, Charlotte B. Avery, Mildred A. Disbrow, Frank J. Dixon, Lois M. Hilgeman; University of Portland, Claudia Cleveland; Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Harold E. Mazyck, Jr., Igal E. Spraggins; Princeton University, Herbert H. Fockler; College of Puget Sound, John T. Lantz; Purdue University, Maurice Beebe, P. Vincent Flannery, Charles H. Green, Robert S. Hunting, Robert B. Ogle, Hyman Serbin, George E. Smith.

Queens College (New York), Mark Blaug, Gwladys Crosby, Edward M. Greenberg, Carl E. Hiller, Banesh Hoffmann, Leo S. Kaplan, Lucile Lindberg, Lucy G. Polansky, Ernst J. Schlochau, Sidney Thomas, Phyllis C. Wilson; Queens College (North Carolina), Lee L. Alvarez, William J. Brady, Jr., Lawrence H. Chewning, Jr., Nancy Eagle, Perry B. Fredericks, E. Lindsey Merrill; Quinnipiac College, Harry L. Bennett, Edward J. Gacek, C. Wendell King.

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, William R. Birge; Rhode Island College of Education, Ernest C. Allison, Mildred E. Bassett, Robert L. Brown, Charles O. Ethier, Frank E. Greene, Renato E. Leonelli, Russell Meinhold, Christopher R. Mitchell, Florence M. Ross, Charles W. Underhill, Frank E. Waite; University of Rhode Island, Frederick D. Breslin, Ira C. Castles, James W. Cobble, John J. Donohue, Robert V. Gardner, David G. Geffner, Robert Lepper, Scott MacKenzie, Jr., Robert J. Meyer, John D. Nixon, Jules Piccus, Malcolm C. Shurtleff, Jr., Beverly M. Smith; University of Rochester, Hazel M. Burke; Rosemont College, Amelia A. Colom; Russell Sage College, Charlotte E. Mankey; Rutgers University, Lai-Wing Fung, Norman Kelvin.

Sacramento State College, Aubrey A. Bates, Carl E. Ludwig, Norman Rudy; St. John's University (New York), Arpad F. Kovacs, Vincent L. McMullen, Louis F. Tolle, Walter L. Willigan; St. Lawrence University, Roger A. Pihl, Marguerite C. Reed, Melvin G. Reed; St. Mary's College of California, Ronald McArthur; St. Olaf College, Courtland L. Agre, G. Winston Cassler, Adrian Christenson, Harold H. Ditmanson, Reidar Dittmann, Richard E.

Fehner, Arnold Flaten, Harlan F. Foss, Harold W. Hansen, Ralph H. Haugen, George Helling, Albert M. Holmquist, Grace E. Holstad, Ivar V. Ivask, Blanchard O. Krogstad, Agnes M. Larson, Lucille Lomax, Marie M. Meyer, William H. K. Narum, Theodore F. Nelson, Orwin A. Rustad, Mabel J. Shirley, Ansgar E. Sovik, Edward A. Sovik, Hildegard Stielow, Elaine M. Tracy, Kenneth G. Wilkens, Marvin E. Wyman; **College of St. Thomas**, Donald J. Barrett; **San Bernardino Valley College**, Ambrosia Noetzel; **San Diego State College**, Julia G. Andrews, W. Harold Lauritsen, Ellis E. Roberts, John S. Wright; **San Francisco State College**, Alice P. Breslow; **San Jose State College**, Gladys A. Baird, John M. Berutti, J. Bennet Olson; **University of Santa Clara**, John H. Merryman; **Savannah State College**, Calvin L. Kiah, William B. Nelson; **Seton Hall University**, Charles A. Baatz, Francis M. Kelly; **Shepherd College**, Elster C. Shortt; **Simmons College**, Elizabeth S. Anthony; **University of the South**, Russell K. Hallberg, Henry W. Smith, Jr.; **University of South Carolina**, Arthur E. Fourier, A. Sheffield Hodge, Carl N. Woods, Hernando J. Woods, Jr.; **South Dakota State College**, Robert M. Dimit, Roger D. Epley; **University of South Dakota**, John E. Oyler; **University of Southern California**, Nathan S. Leichman, Colin R. Lovell, Bernard Sherman; **Southern Methodist University**, Lois Bailey, Wayne Rudmose; **Southern State College**, Anne W. Berry, Avalee Cox; **Springfield College**, John A. Cooper; **Stanford University**, Karl M. Birkmeyer, Elwyn Bugge; **State Agricultural and Mechanical College (South Carolina)**, Florence E. Miller; **Stephen F. Austin State College**, Robert T. McKibben; **Stephens College**, Robert A. Carter, Virgil B. Kramper, Richard J. Sokatch; **Stevens Institute of Technology**, Otto J. Karst, Jr.; **Syracuse University**, Donald Austin, Walter R. Baum, Jerome Blackman, Joseph G. Cady, Manuel Chausovsky, Andrew S. Coccari, Joan Curnutt, Edward Erdélyi, Eric F. Gardner, Stanford Goldman, Bruno H. Greene, Marc Guley, Paul M. Halverson, Donald E. Kibbey, Charles R. Langmuir, Marcel E. Lavoie, George F. Leger, Jr., Elizabeth M. Manwell, Robert B. B. Moorman, Bichara Muvdi, John Neter, William A. Pierce, Arthur Poister, Laura A. Preston, Charlotte Reinke, Edward J. Rising, Paul C. Romeo, George Sachs, Albert W. Sedar, Harwood Simmons, Jean I. Simpson, Bernard S. Strauss, Richard E. Stultz, Kin Tong, Marjorie Veit, Thomas H. Walnut, Julius M. Werner, Luke N. Zaccaro.

University of Tampa, Hobart T. Grace, Ching-Ju Ho, Robert L. Mohr; **Temple University**, David L. Chomitz, John Ford, James W. Gaither, Grace M. Lentz, Marian Meinkoth, Stasia M. Ziobrowski; **Tennessee Polytechnic Institute**, E. Oriole Wisner; **Middle Tennessee State College**, S. Belt Keathley; **University of Tennessee**, Carl Alette, Samuel H. Baron, Quill E. Cope, W. Edward Deeds, Richard A. Erickson, Herbert E. Francis, Jr., Gideon W. Fryer, Wallace Givens, Hubert H. Harper, Jr., Beverley E. Holiday, Aaron M. Johnston, Charles W. Keenan, William C. Lawrence, Robert H. Laws, Clarence P. Lee, Martin E. Little, Francis Manis, Elvin E. Overton, Gerald R. Pascal, Howard G. Schaller, J. Ives Townsend, Jr., Harold H. Walker; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, Carl F. Hartman, Roy G. Pickett,

Walter J. Saucier; **East Texas State Teachers College**, James E. Richards; **Texas Technological College**, Ronald Schulz; **University of Texas**, Ruven Greenberg; **University of Toronto**, Richard Johnston; **Tufts College**, Annabelle T. Ashenhurst, Frederick F. Ashenhurst, Donald F. Eschman, Paul A. Dunkerley, Ernest J. Enright, William DeF. Fairchild, Jr., Richard Hirsch, C. Burleigh Wellington; **Tulane University of Louisiana**, Cornelia A. Eddy, Frederick H. Fox, Myrtle T. Moseley, John O. Nigra, Thomas L. Patrick, Mervyn Roe, Mary Rootes, Allen L. Shields, John R. Snively, E. Peter Volpe, Robert C. Whittemore, Hans Wolpe; **University of Tulsa**, Ivie E. Cadenhead, Jr., Robert M. Holmer, Omer K. Whipple.

Union College (Kentucky), Mendell E. Beattie, Kenneth J. Huenink, Barbara J. Hughes, Melville B. Laite, Mary Lou Parker; **Union College and University**, Terrence L. Hansen; **United States Naval Academy**, Gerald E. Wheeler; **Upper Iowa University**, Kenneth F. Martin; **University of Utah**, Paul C. Fawley.

University of Vermont, Peter P. Lawlor, Lois M. Otterman; **Virginia Polytechnic Institute**, Raymond Burhen, Cecil A. Horst, Wilfred B. Howsmon, Jr., Harold P. Marshall; **Virginia Polytechnic Institute (Radford College)**, Franklin P. Hillman; **Virginia State College**, William N. Cooper, Clarence C. Gray III, Hollis S. Tildon, Joel W. Wallace, Milton O. Wilson, Jr., Bernard R. Woodson, Jr.; **Virginia Union University**, Mary-Elizabeth Johnson; **University of Virginia**, Elbert A. Kincaid, Sidman P. Poole.

Wabash College, Herbert Lederer; **Eastern Washington College of Education**, Roger W. Chapman, Zygmunt J. Gasiorowski, Richard H. Hagelin, Karl R. Morrison; **Western Washington College of Education**, James L. Hildebrand; **State College of Washington**, Roger C. Larson; **Washington University**, Elizabeth E. Bacon, Norton M. Bedford, Charles R. Burton, Hampton L. Carson, Barry Commoner, Liselotte Dieckmann, Gus D. Dorough, Jr., C. David Gutsche, Frederick Hartt, Lindsay Helmholtz, Lewis B. Hilton, Hilde L. Hochwald, J. Edward Kidder, Jr., Lorraine F. Lake, Bruce Melin, Florence Moog, Henry Primakoff, John R. Ring, Saul Rosenzweig, Marlow Sholander, John C. Sowden, Lincoln B. Spiess, Jonathan Townsend, Arthur C. Wahl; **University of Washington**, William T. Simpson; **Western College for Women**, Ralph F. Cox; **Western Reserve University**, Benjamin P. Bole, Jr., Edward G. Evans, Jr., William E. Lawrence, Agnes H. Schroeder, Paul P. Sherwood; **Wilkes College**, Alfred S. Groh, Arthur N. Kruger; **College of William and Mary**, Donna K. Barrand; **College of William and Mary (Richmond Professional Institute)**, Allan A. Eastman, Ruth H. Hyland, Bette J. Lempke, Franklin Shepperson, William P. Spence, Donald B. Tennant, Miles W. Woods; **Williams College**, Robert C. Vernon; **Wilmington College**, Rose Bartsch, Eugene M. Derby, Graydon W. Yapple; **Wisconsin State College (Whitewater)**, Henry A. DeWind, Mary B. Mills, George H. Roseman, Warren J. Thomsen, B. Charles Williams; **University of Wisconsin**, Clifton B. Kroeber; **College of Wooster**, John S. Linnell, Arnold L. Weinkauff, Iver Yeager; **University of Wyoming**, Ray S. Hewitt, Irene Rosenfeld.

Yale University, E. Peter Geiduschek, John O. Nelson; Yeshiva University, Joshua Matz.

Junior

Bowling Green State University, Fred Gerlach, Ralph W. Rotsel, Mary Thuma, Neil H. Watkins; University of Chicago, Leon D. Bramson; Cornell University, Robert A. Beck, Ralph E. Crabill, Jr., Conrad H. Rawski; University of Maryland, George E. Avery; University of Rhode Island, Francis F. Greetham, Jr., Stuart E. Prall, Nancy Sullivan; St. Louis University, John G. Keller; Syracuse University, Richard L. Lawton, Robert L. Layton, Albert J. P. McCarthy, Louis Robinson, Stuart C. Rothwell, Roland F. Smith, James E. Snover, Frederick B. Watts; University of Tennessee, William M. McGill, Malcolm R. Ware, Jr.; Eastern Washington College of Education, Opal Fleckenstein; Washington University, Ronald Bloore, William H. Grate, Dale Haworth, Joseph M. Thom; Not In Accredited Institutional Connection, Anne C. Greve (Ph.D., University of Minnesota), Bethany, Oklahoma; Henry Guze (Ph.D., New York University), Brooklyn, New York; R. Frank Harwood (Graduate work, New York University), Charlotte, North Carolina; Joseph Schiffman (Ph.D., New York University), Brooklyn, New York; Louis E. Shaeffer (A. M., University of Chicago), Ada, Ohio; Ernest C. Shawcross (Graduate work, Columbia University), Cranford, New Jersey; Sibyl B. Silverman (M. S. W., St. Louis University), Chicago, Illinois; Charles E. White (M. A., University of Texas), San Antonio, Texas.

Elections to Membership

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election to membership in the Association of 601 Active and 38 Junior Members as follows:

Active

University of Akron, Emma D. Lindsey; Alabama College, Minnie Dunn, E. P. Hood; Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Robert F. Clothier; Alabama State College (Montgomery), Sanford D. Bishop; Alabama State Teachers College (Florence), William H. Waite; Alabama State Teachers College (Jacksonville), Margaret Rice; University of Alabama, W. Kendrick Hare; Albright College, Morton W. Huber, Mary Jane Ward; Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College, Jimmie King, Jr.; Alfred University, Harold P. Van Cott; American International College, O. Dean Gregory; Amherst College, Haskell R. Coplin; University of Arkansas, Hugh H. Iltis; Army Language School, Marina Arensbarger, Ann Arpaolu, Ionel Grigoriu, Wladyslaw Grzymala-Siedlecki, Nicholas A. Hall, Te-Tseng Liu, Arild Molgaard, Paul F. Orlov, Alexander V. Pavlov, Marianna A. Poltoratzky, Anna Potop, Roman A. Sturmer, Leon Vasu; Augustana College (Illinois), H. Rex Wilson.

Baldwin-Wallace College, Clyde L. Haselden; Bard College, William Hum-

phrey, Joan Larkey, Muriel J. Marker, Antares Parvulescu, Theodore R. Weiss; **Beloit College**, John P. Gwin; **Benedict College**, Edward E. Riley, Jr.; **Bennington College**, Samuel W. Bloom, Catharine O. Foster, Claude Frank, Francis Golfing, Orrea Pernel, Anne V. Schlabach, Gunnar Schonbeck, Daniel Shapiro, Rush E. Welter, Thomas Wilcox, Robert H. Woodworth; **Blue Mountain College**, Daniel M. McFarland; **Bradley University**, Laurence E. Norton; **Brandeis University**, Sidney Golden; **Brooklyn College**, Malcom S. Coxe, Vernon R. Finley, Nicholas Fontana, James H. Gibson, Margaret B. Parke, Fan Parker, Corinne C. Weston, Melvin I. White; **Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn**, Ervine M. Rips; **Brown University**, Wolfgang Leppmann; **Butler University**, John W. Best.

University of California, David D. Boyden; **University of California (Los Angeles)**, Wayland D. Hand; **Canal Zone Junior College**, James A. Lyons; **Carroll College**, Robert T. Anderson, Eugene R. Moulton, John G. Rhind; **Carson-Newman College**, Douglas J. Harris; **Catholic University of America**, Edgar Barrett, Leonard F. Cain, Lucille K. Corbett, John T. Dugan, Adolph C. Hugin, Frederick W. Locke, James J. McPadden, Margherita Morreale, William J. Ryan; **Central College (Iowa)**, John W. Beardslee, 3rd; **Central State College (Oklahoma)**, E. Bertha Hamill; **University of Chicago**, Adrian Albert, John P. Netherton, Kenneth W. Thompson; **University of Cincinnati**, August Biederman, Donald L. Crews, William R. Harlow, George D. Moon; **The City College (Commerce Center)**, Philip Wolfson; **Coe College**, Herbert F. Wiese; **Colgate University**, Michael W. Stein; **Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Paul S. Eskridge; **Columbia University**, Virginia Bellsmith, Allen H. Chappel, Irving Miller, Joseph B. Raymond; **Teachers College of Connecticut**, Pauline M. Alt; **University of Connecticut**, Edward V. Gant; **East Contra Costa Junior College**, Richard J. Worthen; **Cornell University**, Harlan P. Banks, Paul P. Bijlaard, Peter M. Blau, Norman A. Bonner, Charles A. Bratton, George C. Christensen, Robert T. Clausen, DeLos F. Detar, Freeman J. Dyson, Herbert Everett, Gordon H. Fairbanks, James A. Fay, William A. Feder, Felician F. Foltman, Herbert I. Goldstone, George G. Gyrisco, John B. Harcourt, Barbour L. Herrington, Julian E. Hochberg, Dorothy M. Klitzke, Duncan M. MacIntyre, Edward O. Moe, Gertrude Puckett, Edwin L. Resler, Jr., Carlo Riparbelli, Kenneth L. Robinson, Morris Rosenberg, Harold A. Scheraga, Harold Shadick, Michell J. Sienko, Marcus Singer, Patricia C. Smith, Charles H. Stern, Louis Toth, Jean Warren, Robin M. Williams, Jr., John P. Windmuller, Lev Zetlin.

Davidson College, Bradley D. Thompson; **Delta State Teachers College**, Florence A. Kirk; **Denison University**, Clayton K. Bishop; **De Paul University**, John Battle, George L. Yager; **Dickinson College**, Hugh H. Mercer, Charles C. Sellers; **Dillard University**, Norman A. Holmes, Daniel C. Thompson; **Drake University**, Stanley O. Hess, William Wyman; **University of Dubuque**, E. Alan Martens.

East Carolina College, George Pasti, Jr., Richard C. Todd; **Elmhurst College**, Robert E. Koenig; **Emory University**, Claude H. Thompson.

Fayetteville State Teachers College, Lafayette Parker, Howard S. Smith; Florida State University, Paul Scalera, Nicholas M. Vincent; Fordham University, Joseph F. Maloney; Fresno State College, Madge Wilson.

Georgetown University, Lev E. Dobriansky, John R. Fernstrom, Joseph S. Ives, Jr., Thomas J. O'Donnell, Dante Sena; Gonzaga University, Maurice G. Flaherty.

Haverford College, William B. Schwab; University of Hawaii, Gladys King; Hiram College, Edward B. Rosser, Edith Scottron, Ruth T. Whitcomb; Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Shelton MacLeod; Hofstra College, William M. Dobriner, Aigard P. Whitney; College of the Holy Cross, Robert S. Crowe, Charles A. Grant, William H. McCann.

Idaho State College, Louis J. Dellaport, Edson Fichter, Robert G. Lowder, Rufus A. Lyman; University of Idaho, Roy A. Bell, Edith Betts, J. Lawrence Botsford, Alfred W. Bowers, William H. Boyer, Calder T. Bressler, Douglas Caton, Edmund M. Chavez, Carl Claus, Margaret Coffey, Marian I. Frykman, Milton H. Hoehn, Dwight S. Hoffman, Thomas F. Hopkins, Kermit F. Hosch, Thomas B. Keith, Eric B. Kirkland, Miriam Little, Mabel Locke, Donald C. Lowrie, James F. McDivitt, Don A. Marshall, Darwin L. Mayfield, Joseph Newton, Howard E. Packenham, Clayton M. Page, Virgil S. Pratt, Joan Rapaich, Francis Seaman, Theodore A. Sherman, Richard J. Smith, William H. Tenney, Helen J. Terry, Cornelis Visser, Scott A. Walker, Edward Whitehead, Joe W. Wray, Wayne F. Young; Iliff School of Theology, Howard M. Ham; Illinois Institute of Technology, Harry E. Gunning; Northern Illinois State Teachers College, Florence L. Adolph; Southern Illinois University, John C. Kelley; University of Illinois, Ruth C. Fosnaugh, Ann E. Jewett; University of Illinois (Navy Pier), Raymond C. Ingraham, Kenneth M. Madison; Indiana University, Lloyd R. Ahlf, Walter F. Brown, Troy J. Cauley, Janis D. Cooley, Maxine Dunfee, William Hered, Hanne J. Hicks, Romola L. Hicks, Christian W. Jung, Philip Peak, Helenka Sagl, Virgil E. Schooler, Maurice E. Stapley, Leo Steppat, Jacob Sudermann, Robert Towns

Jersey City Junior College, George M. Maxwell; Johns Hopkins University, Richard T. Cox, Philip W. Davies, James E. Deese, Ward Edwards, W. R. Garner, Homer Halvorson, Edward H. Harris, George E. Owen, Henry T. Rowell, V. Peter Sokoloff, J. Trueman Thompson, George F. Wislicenus, Abel Wolman, Hsuan Yeh.

University of Kansas, Rupert Murrill; University of Kansas City, Donald J. Berthrong; Kentucky State College, Arnold W. Wright; Eastern Kentucky State College, Keith Brooks, Jonathan T. Dorris, Alvin G. McGlasson; University of Kentucky, Lysle W. Croft, Lynn Jacobsen.

Los Angeles State College, Sib O. Hansen, Bernard L. Hoyt, Tully E. Warren; Southeastern Louisiana College, Margaret W. Alford, Norman Attenhofer, Ruth C. Carter, Elizabeth Gallaher, Donald S. Harper, Paul Lawrence, Maud E. Palmer, Catherine E. Planche, Ronald D. Stetzel; Loyola University (Illinois), Frank W. Pellettiere, Charles C. Slater, Anthony B. Tabor.

Manhattan College, Thomas R. Milligan; University of Manitoba, Roland Wise; University of Maryland, Jack C. Barnes, Marion C. George, Jr., Benja-

min Lucas, Melvin H. Miller, Hester B. Provinsen; **Maryville College** (Tennessee), Arda S. Walker; **Massachusetts State Teachers College** (Lowell), Cyrus D. Thompson; **University of Massachusetts**, Joseph F. Hill, Jr.; **Miami University**, David W. Bergstrom, Joseph E. Black, Edgar M. Branch, Elizabeth A. Freel, David T. Lewis, Duane T. Maunder, Harold E. Mohr, Edwin E. Morgan, Everett F. Nelson, Alan C. Rankin, Max B. Rosselot, Charles T. Smith, R. Fred Woodruff, Glen G. Yankee; **Central Michigan College of Education**, Herbert L. Curry; **Western Michigan College of Education**, Alfred H. Nadelman; **Michigan State College**, Paul H. Barrett, Mary A. Burmester, Hans Nathan, Edward V. Perkins; **University of Michigan**, John Atkinson, Herbert C. Barrows, Jr., Henry Bretton, Roger Brown, Bernard J. Choseed, Taylor Culbert, Horace W. Dewey, Allen Dittmann, Russell H. Fifield, Frank Grace, Ronald S. Johnson, Robert J. Lowry, Paul W. McCracken, Daniel S. McHargue, Daniel Miller, John Muehl, George A. Peek, Jr., Eric W. Stockton, Warren H. Wagner, Jr., Lewis E. Wehmeyer; **Mills College**, Howard L. Cogswell; **Minnesota State Teachers College** (Winona), G. Ione Bryant; **University of Minnesota**, Watson Fulks, Helen C. Hanson, Wesley N. Herr; **University of Minnesota (Duluth)**, Edwin B. Wenzel; **Mississippi Southern College**, Eric L. Thurston; **Mississippi State College**, Celia P. Campbell, Mary E. Evans, Lyle E. Nelson, Margarette Peebles; **Mississippi State College for Women**, Elizabeth J. Dice, S. Frances Whitener; **Central Missouri State College**, Ammon D. Roberson; **Southwest Missouri State College**, Jack W. Gaston; **University of Missouri**, John C. Murdock; **Monmouth Junior College**, Wesley Camp, Anna R. R. Jennings; **Eastern Montana College of Education**, Arthur E. Soulsby; **Western Montana College of Education**, Gladys A. Forester, Virginia O'Reilly, Elizabeth Satter; **Montana State University**, Frederick R. Fosmire; **Monterey Peninsula College**, Franklin A. Young; **Montreal University**, Ludwik Rabcewicz-Zubkowski; **Morehead State College**, Marjorie J. Palmquist; **Mount Holyoke College**, Marian Hayes; **Murray State College**, Bob L. Mowery.

University of Nebraska, Gene B. Hardy; **New Haven State Teachers College**, Bertram Sarason; **New Jersey State Teachers College** (Newark), Ruth E. Kane; **New Jersey State Teachers College** (Trenton), Helen M. Carpenter; **New Mexico Highlands University**, Karl H. Moltmann; **University of New Mexico**, Robert G. Conway; **New York State Teachers College** (Cortland), Robert F. Powell; **New York State Teachers College** (Fredonia), Helen Gunderson; **New York State Teachers College** (Oneonta), Elizabeth M. Coulter, Roy A. Edelfelt, Laurence B. Goodrich, Norma R. Law, Mary Nankivel, Agnes Nelson, Gertrude W. Rounds, Robert W. Rounds; **New York State Teachers College** (Oswego), Roy A. Brown; **New York University**, Amanda Caldwell, Abraham Glicksberg, Emilio L. Guerra, Frank G. Jennings; **Newark College of Engineering**, Nelson C. Keables, John T. Shawcross; **Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina**, James P. Goss, Jr.; **North Carolina State College**, Emmett B. Morrow; **University of North Carolina**, George J. Kachergis; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Sidney S.

Chernick; **University of North Dakota**, Glen L. Hoffman, Melvin E. Koons; **Northwestern University**, Clair O. Musser, Orville W. Roberts, George Springer; **Norwich University**, Carl L. Anderson, Holden B. Bickford, Philip B. Clarkson, John D. Cushing, William L. Edgerton, Walter D. Emerson, Douglas P. Fay, Victor H. Johnson, Richard M. McNeer, Joseph E. Madden, Hubert W. Mara, Sidney G. Morse, Edward A. Race, Richard W. Reed, Edward A. Sheldon.

Ohio State University, Erwin J. Lotsof, William B. McBride, C. F. McNeil, Paul H. Mussen, Philburn Ratoosh; **Ohio University**, Frederick D. Kershner, Jr., Idus Murphree; **Oklahoma Baptist University**, Edward Hurt, Jr., Ernestine Leverett, Katherine Rader; **Oklahoma City University**, Richard J. A. Struck; **University of Oklahoma**, Walter J. Ewbank, Lewis M. Killian; **Orange County Community College**, Warren B. Searles; **Southern Oregon College of Education**, Oscar C. Bjorlie, Bill A. Sampson; **Oregon State College**, Rhoda Manning, David B. Nicodemus; **Oregon State System of Higher Education, General Extension Service (Vanport Center)**, Dorothy-Jane M. Seats, Warren W. Wilcox; **University of Oregon**, Thomas O. Ballinger, Will Drum, Dirk Jellema, Donald F. Swinehart; **University of Oregon (Medical School)**, Anthony A. Pearson.

Pace College, Robert S. Berlin, William G. P. Donaghy, Benjamin T. Ford, Alfreda J. Geiger, Richard M. Matthews, Jesse S. Raphael, Gilbert M. Rubenstein, Thomas E. Sayles, John C. Sherry, William X. Taylor, Jr., Jack E. Venema; **Parsons College**, John F. Harvey; **Pennsylvania State College**, Howard A. Cutler, Leslie P. Greenhill, Eugene A. Myers, Richard C. Nicholas, Guy E. Rindone, Edwin S. Roscoe; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Indiana)**, Robert W. Burggraf; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Shippensburg)**, Myra C. Esh; **University of Pennsylvania**, Raymond J. Bradley, Marshall Dill, Jr., Charles F. Heye, Harold A. Lockwood, Jr., William L. Smyser; **Philander Smith College**, Milton A. Lawson; **University of Pittsburgh**, Joseph B. Cramer, Maria Fuld, John V. Gorton, Keith E. MacEachron, Margaret B. McFarland, Betty J. McWilliams, Anne G. Nadle, Benjamin Spock, Samuel M. Wishik; **Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Carrie B. Coss, Kathryn Jordan, Ruth Outlaw, Carolyn Y. Prunty; **Princeton University**, E. Laurence Chalmers, Jr., Edward A. McCormick; **Polytechnic Institute of Puerto Rico**, Emilio A. Nazario; **University of Puerto Rico**, Conrado F. Asenjo; **Purdue University**, Nancy Brock, Lewis Freed, Margaret M. Thompson, Marilyn Vanderwarf.

Reed College, Vera K. Krivoshein; **Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute**, Kent D. Lawson; **Rice Institute**, Niels C. Nielsen, Jr.; **University of Rochester**, Samuel M. Caplin, Lewis D. Conta, William B. Muchmore.

Sacramento State College, Ira R. Woodworth; **St. Bonaventure University**, John Kohlhepp; **St. Louis University**, Henry K. Juncerstorff; **St. Olaf College**, Howard Hong, Alf Houkom, Loring D. Knecht, Howard T. Lutz, Etta A. Scott; **San Francisco State College**, Andreina Becker-Colonna, Albert R. Lepore; **Seton Hall University**, A. Brent Spooner; **Seton Hill College**,

Irvin M. Sandson; **Shepherd College**, John B. Swecker; **Simmons College**, J. Harold Hadley; **University of the South**, Kenneth E. Cromer, Robert A. Degen; **University of Southern California**, Carl Q. Christol, Ellery C. Stowell, Jr.; **Southwestern University**, L. H. Merzbach; **Stanford University**, Robert N. Bush, Lester M. Field, Marian Williams; **Stetson University**, Esther M. Hick; **Syracuse University**, Vladimir Korolenko, Balys Paliokas, Felix Witzinger.

Taylor University, Hildreth M. Cross; **Temple University**, Nathan J. Levine, Rudolf Staffel, Malvin D. Stern, Samuel D. Wehr, Marie A. Wurster; **Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State College**, Hilliard H. Bowen, Clinton D. Crooks; **East Tennessee State College**, Catharine P. Baker, Robert G. Crawford, Loyd T. Roberts; **Middle Tennessee State College**, Guy A. Battle, Wilmoth B. Bowdoin, Clifford M. Byrne, Charles E. Howard, J. Gerald Parchment, Neil H. Wright; **University of Tennessee**, Frederick H. Meyers, Charles E. Noyes; **Texas Southern University**, George Brooks, Carolyn M. Dion, Jesse E. Gloster, John M. Guthrie, Eural G. Jackson, Robert J. Terry, Oliver W. Tyler, Edwina C. Williams; **North Texas State College**, Lee W. Miller; **University of Texas**, John R. Kirk; **Tufts College**, Attilio Canzanelli, David Feller, Florence E. Gray, Zareh Hadidian, Robert L. Harrington, Alvin H. Howell, David Rapport, Aldo P. Truant; **Tulane University of Louisiana**, Richard L. Barber, Joseph Donaldson, Jr., William A. Pierce, Jr.

United States Naval Academy, Royal S. Pease; **Upper Iowa University**, Wilson C. Gill; **Utah State Agricultural College**, Lois Downs; **University of Utah**, Harold R. Bradford.

Vanderbilt University, D. F. Fleming, Raymond E. Lindgren, William H. Nicholls, Samuel Sandmel; **Virginia Polytechnic Institute**, Edgar V. Russell, Jr.

Wagner Memorial Lutheran College, George A. Giesemann, Richard H. Heep; **Wake Forest College**, Edwin G. Wilson; **Washburn Municipal University of Topeka**, Helen T. Fisher; **Washington University**, David B. Carpenter, Donald F. Chamberlain, Samuel Davis, William E. Gordon, Philip S. Jastram, Martin D. Kamen, Merle Kling, Walter Leighton, Jr., Theodore McNelly, Winifred K. Magdsick, Donald Meltzer, Mina D. Morris, Philip Newmark, David W. Salmon, Franklin B. Shull, Peggy L. Wood; **University of Washington**, H. Stanley Bennett, John M. Maki, Arnold Stein; **Wesleyan University**, Hayden Scott; **Westbrook Junior College**, Arthur L. Freundlich; **Westminster College (Pennsylvania)**, Hugh Rawls; **Wheaton College (Massachusetts)**, Elizabeth L. White; **Wilberforce University**, John P. White; **University of Wisconsin**, Maurice Leon; **Wittenberg College**, E. James Brownson, Fritz K. Holcker; **College of Wooster**, Harold B. Smith.

Yale University, Arthur W. Hoffman, Edward B. Irving, Jr., George DeF. Lord, Kay C. Montgomery; **Yeshiva University**, Abraham B. Hurwitz, Emanuel Maier, David Mirsky, Emanuel Rackman, Morris Silverman, Arthur D. Tauber, Meyer Terkel, Hyman S. Wettstein.

Transfers from Junior to Active

Bradley University, Kalman Goldberg; Dillard University, Leon Solomon; University of Dubuque, Amber G. Sembower; University of Illinois (Navy Pier), Norman R. Atwood; Monmouth Junior College, Alvin C. Beckett; Northern State Teachers College, Kenneth V. Olson; Pennsylvania State College, Gordon K. Grigsby; University of Pennsylvania, Richard K. Meeker; Philadelphia College of Osteopathy, R. H. Bowman; Purdue University, Abraham Blum; Wayne University, Robert C. Hart; University of Wyoming, Jerry A. O'Callaghan.

Junior

Columbia University, Douglas Gold; Cornell University, Edwin Black, Abraham Blum, Jarka M. Burian, George T. Fitzelle, Kalman Goldberg, Marvin E. Goodstein, Harry P. Kerr, John R. Moore, James W. Pence, Jr., William F. Railing, Tom de Vries; University of Hawaii, Max Templeman; University of Kentucky, George J. Ruschell; University of Massachusetts, Paul E. Woodard; New York University, E. Frederic Knauth; University of Pittsburgh, Ching Chun Li; Washington University, James D. Koerner, John E. Sunder; Not in Accredited Institutional Connection, Henry W. Adrian (Graduate work, New York University), Bayside, Long Island, New York; Louis D. Corson (Graduate work, Stanford University), Wheeling, West Virginia; Francis X. Day (Graduate work, Boston University), West Roxbury, Massachusetts; William H. Desmonde (Ph.D., Columbia University), Yonkers, New York; Edwin F. Fleche (M.A., University of Michigan), Andover, Massachusetts; Joseph Frank (Graduate work, Columbia University), Oceanport, New Jersey; Samuel Greenwald (Graduate work, Boston University), Boston, Massachusetts; Donald A. Kearns (Graduate work, Boston University), Middleton, Massachusetts; Arwid O. Kumin-Kumins (Graduate work, University of Bonn), Putnam, Connecticut; Joseph Margolis (Graduate work, Columbia University), Brooklyn, New York; W. Robert Marisa (Ph.D., Sorbonne), Safford, Arizona; Kathleen M. Murphy (Graduate work, Catholic University of America), Lawrence, Massachusetts; Ralph P. Parrotta (M.A., Boston College), Lawrence, Massachusetts; Raymond Polin (Graduate work, New York University), Mt. Vernon, New York; Vincent J. Ribaud (Graduate work, Boston University), Andover, Massachusetts; C. Harold Ripper (Ph.D., State University of Iowa), Bethany, Oklahoma; David E. Sarfaty (M.A., Columbia University), Jackson Heights, New York; Russell G. Schofield (Ph.D., Harvard University), Magnolia, Massachusetts; Francis T. Williams (Ph.D., Fordham University), Lemont, Illinois.

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

To assist in the placement of college and university teachers the American Association of University Professors publishes notices of academic vacancies and of teachers available. Factual data and expressions of personal preference in these notices are published as submitted. It is optional with appointing officers and teachers to publish names and addresses or to use key numbers.

Letters in response to announcements published under key numbers should be sent to the Association's central office for forwarding to the persons concerned. Address in care of the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Vacancies Reported

Business Administration, Accounting: Eastern public junior college seeking man with the doctorate and 5 years' college experience to serve as head of its business curricula. V 1313

Business Administration (to teach all business courses): Ph.D. or Ed.D. and at least five years' college teaching are required. Must have a man (age 40-45) who knows his field thoroughly and who is qualified to meet the leaders of business and industry in the city and secure their cooperation with the college. Salary, \$5000. Inquiries should be addressed to the Associated Teachers' Agency, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City 36.

Marketing: Midwestern university wants man to teach marketing, advertising, and sales. One-year appointment to replace man studying for doctorate; position open as of September, 1953. V 1314

Mathematics: Vacancy in college located in Northeast. Prefer Master's degree, but a strong Bachelor's degree candidate will be considered for an instructorship provided he works for a Ph.D. degree at a nearby university or elsewhere. Salary for an instructorship about \$3200 per year; higher rank and salary for Ph.D. degree. Work to begin September, 1953. V 1315

A small Southwestern university is interested in the following additions to its staff:

- Director of physical education, requirement, Ph.D.
- Professor of organic chemistry, requirement, Ph.D.
- Professor of economics, requirement, Ph.D.
- Educational research man, requirement, Ph.D.
- Librarian of experience and imagination, requirement, M.A. or M.L.S.
- Home economics teacher, requirement, M.A.

V 1316

The U.S.A.F. Institute of Technology has several vacancies for qualified professors or engineers to teach on a graduate and undergraduate level in aeronautical, mechanical, electrical, and production engineering and mathematics. Employment will be effected in accordance with Civil Service Regulations. Grade levels range from GS-9, \$5060 per annum to GS-13, \$8360 per annum. Applications should be made on Standard Form 57 available at any Post Office or by letter to the Dean, Resident College, U.S.A.F. Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Teachers Available

Administration, German, American History: B.A., M.A., A.M., and Ph.D. by fall 1953. 6 years of high-school teaching and administrative experience, besides 7 years of teaching in liberal arts colleges. Desire position teaching above subjects, administration, guidance and personnel work, or any combination of above.

A 4338

Art: Woman, young. M.A., Teachers College, Columbia University; B.A., Hunter College; Certificate, Cooper Union Art School. 10 years' experience teaching in colleges, adult education, and public schools. Taught painting, art history, ceramics and other crafts. Previously government art specialist and stage designer. Some work done in teaching through radio and television.

A 4339

Audio-Visual (Instruction and Administration): Married man, 30, 1 child. B.S., M.S., Ed.D. candidate August, 1953. 6 years' teaching experience—3 years' college teaching in audio-visual education training in secondary administration. At present full-time Doctorate student but desire teaching or administration position, September, 1953.

A 4340

Biologist: Botany; Bacteriology (general and medical); strong zoology background: Woman, Ph.D. Now doing post-doctoral study; Sigma Xi; listed in professional bibliographies. Academic and research experience; publications. Desire liberal arts college (coed. or woman's college), or university teaching with some opportunity for teaching advanced courses. Available summer or fall, 1953.

A 4341

Biologist, Zoologist: Man, 41, married. Ph.D., zoology. Broad training and experience in biology, zoology and physiology, including teaching and research in medical school. Administrative experience. Member national honorary and professional societies. Interested in professorship or chairmanship of department of biology or zoology. Available summer or fall, 1953.

A 4342

Biologist, Zoologist: Man, 35, married, 1 child, veteran. B.S. in chemistry, M.S. and Ph.D. in zoology (minors in botany and geology). 7 years' experience in teaching laboratory and lecture sections in biological sciences, vertebrate anatomy, and geology. Competent to teach ecology, systematics, and related fields. Major field: aquatic ecology, vertebrate zoology; minor fields: geology and general botany. Member of professional and scientific societies including Phi Sigma and Sigma Xi. Publications and awards. Desire teaching position with opportunity for research. Excellent references. Available June or September, 1953.

A 4404

Botany, Plant Pathology-Mycology: Man, 54, married, no children. B.Sc., M.Sc., D.Sc. 25 years of experience. Desire teaching or teaching and research position. Travelled extensively in Europe. Knowledge of foreign languages. Available within reasonable period.

A 4343

Chemistry: Man, 27. B.Ch.E., M.A., Columbia University, Ph.D. in physical-organic chemistry. 4 years' college teaching (general, organic, and physical chemistry). Married, 1 youngster, veteran. Phi Lambda Upsilon, Sigma Xi, A. C. S., A. A. U. P. Publications pending. Desire opportunity to teach general and undergraduate and graduate organic chemistry (modern approach) in medium-sized college or university giving advanced degree. Experienced as faculty adviser in campus activities and would like to continue such responsibility. Available June, 1953.

A 4344

Chemistry (analytical and inorganic): Ph.D. Age 69. Retire in June, 1953. Experienced teacher (small New England college on A. C. S. accredited list). Desire one or two-year appointment in U. S. A. or abroad.

A 4345

Chemistry, organic: Man, 47. Ph.D. 20 years' experience in undergraduate and

graduate teaching and in directing M.S. and Ph.D. research; 60 scientific publications, administrative experience, *Who's Who*. Desire full or associate professorship in institution with facilities for research. Available on reasonable notice. Protestant. A 4346

Classics (Greek and Latin languages and literatures) and related subjects (e.g., scientific terminology in English of Greek and Latin origin; Greek and Latin elements in English; ancient Greek religion and mythology; comparative Indo-European, comparative Greek and Latin grammar; etc.): Man, 44, married. Ph.D. Assistant professor in classics and linguistics; several years of teaching experience in large universities. Research work and publications. Desire associate or assistant professorship. Available June, 1953. A 4347

Dean (or Assistant Dean) of Women: A.B., Pennsylvania College for Women; A.M., Teachers College, Columbia University. 12 years of teaching experience in public and private schools; 4 years' experience as assistant dean and as dean. Seek employment in private school or college. Available June, 1953. A 4348

Economics or Business Administration (Economics, Business Law, Marketing, Retailing, Personnel Management, Labor Relations, Labor Law, Labor Economics): Man, 40. B.S., 3 years of law, completing thesis for LL.D., European university, June, 1953. 4 years' industrial experience and 10 years' business experience. A 4349

Economics, Sociology (Principles and Problems of Economics, Consumer Economics, Economic and Social Movements, International Economic and Social Problems, Social Security, Public Finance, Labor, Money and Banking, General Social Science; also course in Sociology including Marriage and the Family as a specialty—5 years' marriage counseling with emphasis on premarriage counseling, General Sociology, Problems, Social Progress, Educational Sociology): Wish position in economics or economics and sociology. Ph.D., Illinois, with minor in philosophy. 19 years' college teaching experience, 7 years' industrial experience, 1 year social work. Man, 51, married, 2 children. Foremost interest is in teaching. Wife is elementary teacher. June or September, 1953. A 4350

Education: Ph.D. in educational administration and supervision. 20 years' teaching experience from elementary school through college; also supervisory experience in supervising practice teaching in N. Y. C. public schools. Desire position in education and/or administrative and supervisory duties, or any combination. Hold rank of associate professor in college in New York area. Salary optional, depending upon opportunity. Age 51, married, 2 children. A 4351

Education: Man, 48, married. Ed.D., Teachers College, Columbia University; at present Superintendent of Schools in Eastern metropolitan area; 3 years' experience as professor of education at well-recognized liberal arts college, 20 years' experience as high-school teacher and principal. Interested in college administration and all phases of teacher education, including director of student teaching. Member, A. A. S. A., Phi Delta Kappa, Kappa Delta Pi. Listed in *Who's Who in American Education*. Wife also has rich experience in teacher education at university level. Interested in any area of U. S. A. or Western Canada. A 4352

Education-Administration: Man, 38, single. Ph.D. Phi Beta Kappa. 7 years', large Midwestern state university, teaching plus administration (assistant to dean, college of liberal arts), as well as both elementary and high-school experience. Desire position teaching education, or administrative only, or combination of both. Wish to improve upon present salary, minimum rank assistant professor. Available summer session, 1953, and thereafter. A 4353

Education (Dir. Practice-teaching, Administration, Educational Psychology, Supervision, Personnel and Measurement): Man, 51, married. M.A., M.Ed., large Eastern state college and university. Member state and national edu-

cational associations, Association of Secondary School Principals. Experience: many years elementary and high-school teaching and supervising principalship, university instructor in educational psychology, charge student-teachers, educational measurements, teacher-conferences. Presently employed; available summer, 1953, and thereafter. Will only consider permanent position which will better present salary.

A 4354

Engineering: Associate professor at large engineering school would like to consider position at a small school of engineering, preferably one associated with a liberal arts college where the emphasis is on teaching fundamentals. 22 years' experience in industry, teaching and research in the fields of electrical, industrial, and metallurgical engineering.

A 4355

English: Ph.D., University of London. Major field, eighteenth century literature. Book being published by university press. 3 years' full-time teaching experience. Available September, 1953.

A 4356

English: Man, 37, married, family. Ph.D., Yale. 10 years' teaching: Chaucer, seventeenth and eighteenth century literature, novel, freshman, sophomore courses—largely in institution with adult education program. Adviser, student publications. Broad background in fine arts, languages. Publications. Available now.

A 4357

English: Man, 43, single. Ph.D. Special field, Middle English literature and language. Also Romantic Period and survey of English literature. Desire permanent appointment in stable small college or university, preferably in South or East, with opportunity and encouragement for lively teaching and for research. 7 years' college and 6 years' secondary school experience, 5 years' U. S. Army. Available June, 1953.

A 4358

English: Man, married, 2 children. Ph.D., Duke, 1935. Wide experience as college and university professor. Since 1947 at leading Pacific Coast university teaching Romantic poetry, Bible as literature, creative writing. References include distinguished administrators and scholars. Author of standard critical volume on Byron. Byron consultant to University of Chicago Press, 1950-51. Currently engaged in full-time research on Byron as A.C.L.S. Scholar, 1952-53. Major interest: teaching. Other interests: philosophy, religion, music, art, creative writing, Romantic research. Desire associate or full professorship in first-rank small college or university. Available September, 1953. Paul Graham Trueblood, 2120 Santa Cruz Avenue, Menlo Park, California.

English: Man, 34, family. Veteran. B.A., Ph.D., Yale. 5 years' teaching experience. Courses taught: Shakespeare, Advanced Composition, Survey, Introduction to Literature, Freshman Composition. Publications in eighteenth century literature and Shakespeare. Available June, 1953.

A 4359

English and Folklore: Man, 53, 4 dependents. M.A. and 3 years' additional graduate work (English and Folklore). Course requirements for Ph.D. completed and dissertation accepted. 12 years' college and university teaching. Author 2 books (both university press publications) and 75 articles in American and European scholarly journals. Member (active and honorary) of numerous American and foreign professional societies. Listed in *Directory of American Scholars*, *Who Knows—And What*, *Who's Who in the South and Southwest*, and *International Directory of Anthropologists*. Would like position in liberal arts college in Middle West or East, preferably as associate professor (most recent rank). Can furnish excellent recommendations.

A 4360

French: Man. Ph.D. in Romance Languages. Publication. Foreign travel, residence and study.

A 4361

French: Man, French-born, 41, married. Graduate of the Sorbonne (Licence ès-Lettres), Institute of Phonetics, Institute of Ethnology, also School of Oriental Studies, Paris. 15 years' university and college teaching experience, later Di-

rector of French Cultural Institute abroad. Publications in linguistics and history. Residence, widely travelled Europe, Asia. Presently assistant professor in a New England college. Can also teach Italian. Available June, 1953.

A 4362

French: Man, 43, married, 1 son; Phi Beta Kappa. Ph.D. Romance Languages and Literatures, University of North Carolina. Prefer liberal arts college or university in East or Midwest. Have spoken French since childhood, also speak Spanish and Italian; thorough training in Latin. Long experience teaching French and Spanish; also extensive publication with book completed and accepted. Foreign travel. Interests: French philology and literature. Available summer or fall, 1953.

A 4405

French, German: Man, Ph.D., 27 years of teaching experience, excellent references, married. Large number of publications. Could teach history and philosophy. Available after June, 1953.

A 4407

French, Russian: Man, 35, married. American-born veteran. M.A., working on doctorate. 6 years' teaching, 4 of which on the university level. Study in European and American universities. United States Army Intelligence. Write Box 232, Davis, Oklahoma.

French, Spanish: Man, 35. A.B., Bachelor of Foreign Trade, Licence, Doctorate (Sorbonne). Married, 2 children. 7 years' college and secondary experience in languages, adult education. Interpreter with U. S. Military Intelligence overseas. Some publications. Now teaching Spanish junior college. Prefer position in institution which trains language teachers. Available June, 1953.

A 4363

Geography: Man, 33, married, 2 children. A.B., S.M., Ph.D. from first-rank universities. Doctoral thesis published. 4 years' college level teaching experience. Now employed in government defense agency. Desire university position September, 1953.

A 4364

German: Man, 32, veteran, married, 2 children. Ph.D. (German), N. Y. U. 8 years' teaching experience, Indiana University, N. Y. U., etc. Elementary and intermediate German, scientific German, conversational German, German literature. Theses (M.A. and Ph.D.) in the field of modern German literature. Experience in guidance on the college level. Available February or June, 1953.

A 4365

German, Administration: Ph.D., man, 38, single, Phi Beta Kappa. 7 years', large Midwestern state university, teaching plus administration (assistant to dean, college of liberal arts). Desire position teaching German, or administrative only, or combination of both. Wish to improve upon present salary, minimum rank assistant professor. Available summer session, 1953, and thereafter.

A 4366

German, French, Latin, Italian: Man, Ph.D., experienced teacher, publications. Available on reasonable notice, also for summer.

A 4367

History: Man, 32, family. Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania. 6 years' teaching in Eastern university and an outstanding college. Major field, American history, especially Colonial; minor fields, British and Modern European. Book and articles published, new book undergoing final revision. Primarily interested in good teaching.

A 4368

History: Man, 41, married. Ph.D., Harvard, Modern European History. Particular interest and experience in general education programs and cultural history (especially Renaissance and Reformation). For past 3 years with Department of State in Germany; 8 years' teaching experience in outstanding colleges and universities.

A 4369

History: Man, 33, married, 1 child. M.A., Ph.D., Harvard. Veteran with no reserve status. Major field, English history. 3 years' experience in an Eastern state university teaching English history and European history. At present in a

liberal arts college in New England teaching Russian history, political theory and government. Available for September, 1953, and will consider summer school. Prefer Northeast. A 4370

History: Man. A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Chicago. Phi Beta Kappa. 14 years' teaching experience in every branch of history and many branches of political science. Publications. Experienced in radio and student club work. Desire position in four-year liberal arts college or university in ancient or medieval or modern European history field. Middle West preferred. Available September, 1953. A 4371

History: Man, 28, married. M.A., Certificate of the Russian Institute of Columbia University; Ph.D. candidate with all requirements except dissertation. Major field, modern East European history with specialty in modern and recent Russia; minor field, West European history. University teaching experience; academic honors, fellowship. Available summer or fall, 1953. Desire either temporary appointment or permanent position with opportunity to share time between serious teaching and research. Excellent references. A 4372

History: Man, 36. Ph.D. residence, American University. 11 years' teaching in private schools and colleges. Assistant dean. 15 months' historical interpretation and public contact work with historical division of National Park Service. Special interest, American studies. Small family. Available January, 1953. E. T. Crowson, 320 South Virginia Avenue, Falls Church, Virginia.

History or Economics: Man, 37, married, 2 children. Ph.D. (American and European history and economics). 7 years' teaching experience. Author of book and articles. Listed in biographical publications. Now associate professor with permanent tenure at a teachers college. Strong interests in economics. Desire change for financial and professional advancement. Interested in doing both research and good teaching. Nelson Klose, 24 East Sixth, Edmond, Oklahoma.

History, and History of Civilization (History of Civilization, History of Modern Europe, History of Europe in the 18th Century, History of Eastern Europe; Greek Thinkers and Modern Sociology): Doctor of Phil., Doctor of Polit. Sc. Studies and research work in Poland, France, Germany, England, Denmark, Sweden, Italy, Switzerland, and U. S. A. 20 years' teaching experience on college level; last 3 years as head of the history department in American university. Author of 5 scientific books. Man, 47, widower. No smoking or drinking. In very good health. Available fall, 1953. A 4373

History, Political Science: Man, 39, family. Ph.D., European and American training, citizen, Harvard Scholar. 10 years' college teaching, including Eastern universities. Introductory and specialized courses: Russia, Germany, international relations, comparative government, etc. Associate professor in good small college. Listed in *Who's Who* and in *Directory of American Scholars*, excellent references as teacher, lecturer, and researcher, numerous publications, many languages, book on Germany just accepted for publication. Desire change. A 4374

Hygiene, Student Health: Man, 30. A.B., education and psychology; R.N., medical and surgical; Harvard University, graduate work in science education. Experience: Health Counselor (student health program), hygiene and health education instructor, physiology and anatomy instructor, in Midwestern university and public high school, 1950-52. Member: A. A. U. P., American Nurses Association, National Science Teachers Association, Science Teachers of New England, Massachusetts Zoological Society, Kansas Academy of Science, Kansas Psychological Association, Massachusetts State Nurses Association. Publications: *The Psychiatric Aid*, *University Life*, *The Kansas Nurse*. Desire faculty post as Health Counselor (school nurse), and instructor in hygiene in university, college, or preparatory school. A 4375

- Industrial Management, Labor Relations, Personnel Management: Man, 39, married, Ph.D., Midwestern state university, academic and business experience. Supplementary areas of interest and research are industrial supervision and management theory. Desire academic responsibility for one of the listed areas. Available summer or fall, 1953. A 4376
- International Relations, Political Science: Man, 29, married, 2 children. Desire teaching and/or research position. Available September, 1953. A.B., political science; M.A. and Ph.D. in international relations, large Eastern university. General specialties, international relations and comparative government. U.S.S.R. area specialist. Qualified to teach also American government and constitutional law. Research facility in Russian, German, French, and Spanish. Graduate assistant, two years; assistant professor, two years. Extensive research experience; book on Soviet Union in progress. A 4377
- International Relations, Political Science: Man, 28, single, veteran. Desire teaching and/or research position. A.B. *cum laude* in political science, Univ. of Pennsylvania. A.M., Certificate, Russian Institute, Columbia Univ. Expect to complete research on doctoral dissertation by September, 1953. International politics, organization, and law. Area specialist U.S.S.R. International Communism. Also Russian history and language, history and politics of Eastern Europe, political theory, U. S. foreign policy, American government. 2 years' teaching assistant, large municipal college. Broad work experience. Travel in Europe. Publication. Available June or September, 1953. A 4378
- Librarian, Head: Man; M.S. in L.S., reference library experience; assistant law librarian and assistant librarian in a university library. Desire position as head librarian of a liberal arts college or university. A 4379
- Librarian, Head: Man; graduate library school and M.A. degree, some Ph.D. work; experienced head of active college library, now employed; knowledge of building planning, audio-visual service, library instruction; desire position as head librarian of outstanding liberal arts college or university; \$6000. A 4380
- Mathematics: Man, 42, married, 2 children. Ph.D. degree with major in applied mathematics and minors in physics and chemical engineering. 17 years' college teaching experience. Member of American Math. Society, Math. Association of America, A.A.U.P., Sigma Xi, Pi Mu Epsilon, Kappa Mu Epsilon. A 4381
- Mathematics: Man, 35, married, 2 children. Ph.D.; Phi Beta Kappa. Associate professor in engineering college. A 4382
- Mathematics: Man, 42, married. A.B., B.S., M.A., proximate Ph.D. Membership A.A.U.P., American Math. Society, Pi Mu Epsilon. 16 years' teaching experience, all levels. Available immediately. A 4383
- Music: Man, 31, veteran, married, 1 child. B.M., M.M., all Ph.D. work save dissertation completed by June, 1953 (Indiana University). 5 years' college teaching experience. Subjects: theory, music history, composition, organ, piano. Excellent references. Minimum rank, assistant professor. Available fall, 1953. A 4384
- Music (Voice, Music History and Literature): Man, 35, family. B.A. in Ed.; B.Mus., M.Mus. in voice; Ph.D. in music nearly completed at Indiana University School of Music. 5 years' teaching experience, 4 in college. Recital, radio, oratorio, opera experience (tenor). Listed in *Who's Who in Music*. Member A.A.U.P., Theta Alpha Phi, Pi Kappa Lambda, MENC, American Musicological Society. Available June or September, 1953. A 4385
- Occupational Therapy: Woman. M.A., psychology (Columbia). Registered Occupational Therapist in American Occupational Therapy Association. 5 years' teaching and administrating of occupational therapy course in a woman's college. Recent special study in progressive physical medicine therapeutic institutions in Eastern states. Available 1953. A 4386

- Philosophy: Man, 29. B.A., Haverford; M.A. and Ph.D. (thesis in process) from Yale. Phi Beta Kappa, ACLS and Kent Fellowships. Available fall, 1953 for teaching position, preferably in liberal arts college. Full-time teaching experience: ethics, history, introduction, logic, philosophy of religion. Excellent references. Wide interests, travel abroad. A 4387
- Physical Education, Health Education and Recreation: Woman, 39. M.A., now earning Ph.D. at first-rank university. Wide experience teaching, all age levels, including majors in undergraduate and graduate theory and practice courses: all sports, aquatics, camping, health education, etc. Director M.A. theses. Several years' supervision student teachers, mature teachers. Extensive recreation and camping experience. Holder of current national ratings volleyball, basketball. Active participant in many professional and community organizations, including A.A.U.P., A.R.C., A.C.A., N.S.W.A., and A.A.H.P.E.R. Interested in teaching, research, writing; desire permanent position, college or university. References. Available September, 1953. A 4388
- Physics: Summer Session teaching appointment (possibly on exchange basis), or editorial work in physics desired for summer, 1953. Associate professor, author of six textbooks in college physics, and heat; papers on electron microscopy, spectroscopy, and instructional films. Member editorial boards for technical journal and for AAPT-sponsored films. Married, 2 small children. Robert L. Weber, 447 Hillcrest Avenue, State College, Pennsylvania. A 4389
- Physics: Ph.D. (theoretical physics), M.S. (mathematics). Man, 27, Sigma Xi, A.P.S., A.A.A.S., A.A.U.P.; 3 years' teaching experience at college level; 4 research papers. Veteran, no reserve status. Excellent references. Seeking permanent position (initial trial period perfectly acceptable). Available June or September, 1953. A 4390
- Physics: Man, experienced teacher, Ph.D. Interested in position in college having strong physics offering. Available summer or fall, 1953. A 4391
- Political Science: Man, 30, single. M.A., Ph.D. (London). 5½ years' teaching experience. Fields: political theory, comparative European government, English government and British Commonwealth of Nations, comparative local government, governments of Eastern Europe. Currently conducting research under contract. Member A.P.S.A. Veteran. Widely travelled. Journalistic and radio experience. Book forthcoming. Available June, 1953. A 4392
- Political Science: Man, 33, married, 1 child, non-reserve veteran. M.A., Kansas; Ph.D., Melbourne; Phi Beta Kappa. 3 years as instructor at Middle West university; now temporary instructor at large Western university. Interests include American government, political parties, comparative government. British Commonwealth and Asian politics. Have also offered courses on public administration, city government and human relations. Publications include mimeographed casebook, journal and newspaper articles and book reviews. Available June, 1953. A 4393
- Political Science, International Law and Relations: Man, 27, married, 1 child. A.B., political science; M.A., international law and relations (Columbia University); Ph.D. (Columbia University) requirements completed except dissertation; also, law school training. Veteran. Two trips to Europe. Have taught wide variety of political science courses and American history in small liberal arts college. Available summer or fall, 1953. A 4394
- Psychology (Industrial, Psychometrics, Statistics): Man, 35, married, 2 children. Ph.D. in industrial, M.A. in personnel management. 12 years' diversified experience in conduct and direction of industrial and personnel management research, including 5 years in major university research program. Presently industrial psychologist on staff of large industrial concern, but prefer academic position part teaching, part research. About 30 publications. Member Phi

- Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, A.P.A., A.S.A., A.A.A.S., Psychometric Society, Industrial Relations Association. A 4394
- Psychotherapy, Adlerian Analysis: Man, doctoral and postdoctoral work in psychology; experience as a college teacher and as a consultant, publications in education and psychology. Want opportunity. A 4395
- Romance Languages (Philology): Man, 31, M.A., Chicago; Ph.D., North Carolina. Married, no children. Veteran, but not in reserves. Seek combination of undergraduate and graduate teaching, with facilities for research in Romance philology. In addition to standard courses in Ph.D. field (Romance literatures and linguistics), can also offer courses in German on undergraduate level. Did Ph.D. research at the University of Rome, Italy, under a Fulbright Grant. 5 years' teaching experience, including some graduate courses. Outstanding references. Would welcome administrative responsibility. Available spring, summer, or fall, 1953. Would also be interested in appointment for September, 1954. A 4396
- Social Sciences: M.A., University of Texas. 11 years' successful teaching experience. Sula Buie, 210 Jones Street, Gurdon, Arkansas.
- Sociology: Man, 31, married, 2 children, former newspaperman. M.A. from a major university; 3 years' experience teaching sociology and social science survey. Major interests: introductory, social disorganization, race and ethnic relations, communications, social psychology, criminology, political science. 2 articles. Outstanding references. (Residence requirements for Ph.D. completed.) Available June, 1953. A 4397
- Sociology: Man, 28, married. M.A., Ph.D. expected June, 1953. Fields: social organization, industrial, social psychology, rural-urban. Experience: 5 years' university teaching, diverse research experience community, ethnic studies. Publications. Background in psychology, economics. Desire teaching with research opportunity. Available September, 1953. A 4398
- Sociology, Anthropology, Regional Cultures, Current History and Problems (India, Southeast Asia and the Far East): Man, 41, French-born, married. Graduate in Far Eastern anthropology, civilizations and languages (Sorbonne, School of Oriental Studies, Institutes of Ethnology and Phonetics, Paris). 11 consecutive years in the Far East (4 at the staff of a Southeast Asia university, 1 in China, 6 in Japan as a Far Eastern cultural center research Associate, later Director). Several books published, others in process. Also elementary Sanskrit, Pāli, Japanese; Southeast Asian linguistics. Teaching in the U. S. from 1948. Available June, 1953. A 4399
- Sociology or Human Relations: Man, 41, married. Ph.D., University of North Carolina. Listed in *Who's Who in American Education* and *Who Knows—and What*. Member of several professional societies. 10 years' college teaching and 6 years' directing foundation-financed research projects. Several publications. Excellent references. Desire permanent teaching or administrative position at a university or college. Available June, 1953. A 4400
- Speech, Drama, English: Ph.D., Phi Beta Kappa. 2 years' teaching in England-Europe. Business experience in public relations, discussion techniques, public speaking, debate, and interpretation. Have directed graduate research in speech and theater work. Early professional stock acting experience; director in little theaters and colleges; teacher of theater history, dramatic literature and criticism, and esthetics. Interested in both literary and logical analysis. Wide experience in organizing and testing basic courses in speech-drama; several published articles. Available summer-fall. A 4406
- Student Personnel, Guidance, Personnel Management, Education: Man, 30, married, 1 child. B.S., A.M., Ed.M. Will complete doctorate in personnel and guidance at West Coast university in June, 1953. At present, counselor at state

university. Formerly director of guidance in high school and junior college, and before that, counselor in charge of V.A. guidance center at prominent Eastern college. Several published articles in appropriate journals. Active in professional and community associations. Teaching experience in personnel management, guidance, psychology, economics, and education. Member of NVGA, ACPA, APGA, SCPA, AAUP. Available September, 1953. A 4401

Zoology: Man, 38, family, veteran. Ph.D., leading university, entomology, invertebrate zoology. 5 years' university teaching, summer field stations. Numerous publications. Desire associate professorship. A 4402

Zoology and/or Physiology: Man, 33, married. M.A., Ph.D. Major fields: mammalian physiology, endocrinology, radiation biology, histology, embryology. Well versed in comparative anatomy, genetics, cytology, and microtechnique. Currently directing a group of physiologists in studies of radiation injury at a large government laboratory. Promoted three times in five years. A strong urge to teach has led me to seek an academic position which demands the best efforts in both teaching and research. Societies; publications. A 4403

The Association's Correspondence

The Central Office of the American Association of University Professors is called upon to handle annually upwards of 100,000 communications—letters, telegrams, and telephone calls. The professional work of the office, in contra-distinction to the organizational work, involves the consideration of approximately 20,000 of these communications, and in addition participation in conferences with upwards of 500 persons annually. Some of these conferences are away from Washington. All of this work is time consuming. These facts explain why it is not possible for this office to handle all of its correspondence with promptitude, a fact which is deeply regretted and concerning which the staff of this office needs and bespeaks the understanding of the membership of the Association. It is to this end that these facts are published.

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, *General Secretary*